

2

**MEETING THE NEEDS
OF
TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE:**

**Guidelines
for Professional Education
in Public Administration**

(NASA-CR-133036) MEETING THE NEEDS OF TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE: GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (National Academy of Public Administration) 78 p HC \$6.00 CSCL 05A G3/34 N73-25984 Unclass 06421

Richard L. Chapman

and

Frederic N. Cleaveland

REPRODUCTION RESTRICTIONS OVERRIDDEN
NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

January, 1973

**MEETING THE NEEDS
OF
TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE:**

**Guidelines
for Professional Education
in Public Administration**

**Richard L. Chapman
and
Frederic N. Cleaveland**

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

January, 1973

© National Academy of Public Administration Foundation, 1973
1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Table of Contents

Foreword	i
Members of the Advisory Panel	ii
Chapter I	
Education for Public Administration: Its Promise, Challenges, and Opportunities	1
PART I. THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE 1980's CHALLENGES AND NEEDS	
Chapter II	
The Changing Character of the Public Service	9
Chapter III	
The Public Administrator of the 1980's	17
PART II. THE CURRENT STATE OF EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE: ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	
Chapter IV	
Program Structure: Purpose, Organization, Resources, and Content	23
Chapter V	
Program Dynamics: Recruiting, The Learning Environment, Placement, and Program Cohesion	37
PART III. MEETING THE NEEDS OF TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE	
Chapter VI	
Evaluating Education for Public Administration	45
Chapter VII	
Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service: A Program of Positive Action	53
Appendix I	
List of Participants in the Delphi Exercise on Developments Affecting the Public Service, 1971-1980	63
Appendix II	
Institutions Participating in Academy Survey or Visits	67
Appendix III	
Airlie Conference Participants	69
Appendix IV	
Attributes of the Public Service: Their Relative Attainment, 1961-1971	71
Appendix V	
Elements for Socializing Students in a Professional Program of Education for Public Administration	72

Foreword

In 1968 the first Executive Director of the National Academy of Public Administration, George A. Graham, proposed a series of inter-related studies that would: (1) assess the demand for trained administrators at all levels of government and identify the personal qualities, skills, and knowledge that would be needed by future administrators; (2) describe and evaluate the programs of education for the public service, starting with public administration and public affairs programs but extending to professional schools whose graduates frequently enter government service such as law, medicine, engineering, and schools of education; and (3) develop a set of guidelines by which education for the public service might be judged—by students, by universities and faculty, by those providing financial support, and by government officials responsible for hiring well-trained candidates.

It was not possible to undertake the full task as originally conceived. However, a more modest, though not inconsequential, study was undertaken in the Spring of 1971, directed primarily at graduate programs in public administration and the needs of the public service which they seek to meet. This study was financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, and as one task of contract NSR 09-046-001 with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Academy is grateful to both Ford and NASA for their support.

The report which follows is based upon the analysis of a Delphi exercise on the future of the public service, conducted in late 1971 and early 1972; a mail survey of graduate programs in public administration conducted in February and March 1972; site visits in April 1972 to 16 universities responding to the mail survey; and the transcript of a three-day conference on graduate education for public administration attended by 30 scholars, practitioners, and students, held at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, in July 1972.

A seven-member advisory panel contributed greatly to planning the conference, and to reviewing and revising the draft report. This report represents the general consensus of the panel. Both the Airlie conferees and the panel members significantly influenced the general tone of the report to reflect their deep concern that the public administration community recognize the urgent need for effective collective action to develop the kind of public administrators needed to face the demanding challenges of the 1980's. We believe that the report represents an important starting point from which those concerned with the quality and effectiveness of the public service can take action.

Roy W. Crawley
Executive Director

**Academy Panel
Higher Education Guidelines
and Needs of the Public Service**

Frederic N. Cleaveland
Provost
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Roger W. Jones
(Chairman)
Consultant
Office of Management
and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Franklin P. Kilpatrick
Dean
College of Social and
Behavioral Sciences
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Ronald B. Lee
Director, Marketing
Analysis
Xerox Corporation
Stamford, Connecticut

William A. Medina
Chief, Executive Develop-
ment and Training
Branch
Executive Development
and Labor
Relations Division
Office of Management
and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Frederick C. Mosher
Professor, Department of
Government and
Foreign Affairs
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Harold Orlans
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Chapter I

Education for Public Administration: Its Promise, Challenges, and Opportunities

Every day the electronic and printed media serve up a menu of public problems for review by Americans. Too often, it seems, public programs fall short of expectations or wander off course. Foreign aid fails to reach those in need, or a well-intentioned project collapses because of some overlooked taboo. Sanitation workers go on strike and hold a city hostage during final contract negotiations—negotiations for which the city is so ill prepared that it must depend upon a hired arbitrator to represent its interests. Spending for social services is increased by billions, yet the welfare rolls increase and dissatisfaction among the recipients mounts. Americans face the confusing paradox of giving more attention, time, money, and manpower to public problems than at any time in their history, but achieving indifferent or disappointing results. New policy and new programs have received thunderous legislative approval during the past decade only to produce miniscule results. Rightfully people ask, Why can't government—with all of its power and resources—deliver?

A common weakness in many programs aimed at relieving festering social and economic problems has been not a lack of will, but inadequate attention to *how* effective program performance can be delivered. This is a principal concern of public administration. It starts with the process of determining goals and alternative means for reaching those goals, including relative effectiveness and feasibility of the various administrative mechanisms for program accomplishment. It continues through decision making to the marshalling of resources and the operation of the organization to execute a program, and, finally, to developing the system for evaluation and the assessment of program results.

Men and women trained in every occupation contribute to public programs at all levels of government. But it is only the public administration community—those practitioners, scholars and others who consciously identify themselves with public administration as a professional field—which systematically and continuously devotes its primary efforts to improving the performance of government programs and public policy. The community represents an important resource *if* public program policy and performance are to be improved significantly. And the principal fountainhead of professional sustenance for these efforts is the collection of institutes, schools, and departments—primarily located in universities—where education,

problem-solving research, and training are carried out. Public administration has a rich heritage of effectively linking education, research, and reform-oriented action to the solution of important public problems. Training and education for the public service traditionally have been viewed by the public administration community as a critical element in achieving effective performance of governmental functions. Well-motivated, well-trained professionals in public administration are necessary catalysts to combine with the talents of others in making government more honest, rational, efficient, and responsive.

The Origins and Growth of Education for Public Administration

Systematic education for public administration had its beginnings over 60 years ago in 1911, toward the end of the progressive era, when administrative functions of government were performed largely by local governments. Cities had been growing rapidly for three decades with modest, gradual changes in functions. State governments were still chiefly concerned with legislative and judicial processes. The tremendous national initiative in domestic public affairs through the grant-in-aid system had not yet begun, and the dramatic expansion of the federal government's power and functions was to await the "New Deal." Reform movements were struggling with frequently corrupt political machines in the cities. City leaders were fighting for municipal home rule to acquire adequate powers to govern. The steady rise of real estate values was making the general property tax a dependable and comparatively adequate source of revenue. Public administration as a concept was municipally oriented, and the experience of leaders in the field was chiefly in municipal government.

Dr. Frederick A. Cleveland and Henry Bruere in the New York Bureau of Municipal Research dramatized the rational approach to public administration by a study of defective administration in maintaining the streets of Manhattan. Professor Charles E. Merriam was teaching municipal government and running for mayor of Chicago on the Republican ticket. Louis Brownlow was getting his professional education for public administration in journalism, and made his first venture into practice as a District of Columbia commissioner in 1915.

It was soon recognized that public administration necessarily included much more than municipal administration. The Institute for Government Research (the first element of The Brookings Institution), founded in 1916, was a spin-off from the New York Bureau. It was designed to bring the new rational approach to national affairs, especially to federal budget and accounting practices. After American involvement in World War I, the federal government's debt of \$24 billion seemed to be an overhanging menace. The Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, and the Institute for Government Research played an important part in the staff work preparing for the legislation and also in preparing the first budget under the new legislation.

The concept and the terminology of public administration also began to change in the 1920's, even before the expansion of federal functions and powers in the 1930's. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs was established at Syracuse in 1924 (another outgrowth of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research), and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs opened at Princeton in 1929-30. The new term, "public affairs," reflected a broadening concept of public administration, recognition of national problems, and awareness of the challenging questions of what should be done about them. These questions were to gain general attention in the political and judicial battles of the 1930's.

The acceptance of Keynesian activism in governmental guidance of the national economy and the phenomenal growth of national efforts to deal with national problems through federal-state-local government programs (initiated by the President and Congress, and financed in large part by federal funds) are reflected in two new terms coming to currency in the 1960's and the 1970's: "the public sector" and "public policy."

Public administration was an activity of questionable respectability in the United States during the latter half of the 19th century, and its right to exist outside of a narrowly circumscribed area was challenged by the business-economic community through the first half of the 20th century. It has now come to be accepted, even in the business-economic community. Its new accreditation is marked by rechristening as the "public sector." The term public policy reflects the increased need to face the questions of what to do and the choices of how to do it. "Policy and administration are . . . ranges on a larger continuum . . . end and means, theoretical concept and delivered service, objective, implementation, strategy, and execution."¹

¹ John Crecine, *Policy Science*, Vol. 2 (1971), p. 8.

The last word in the definition—execution—is not the least, and it includes the feedback of administrative experience into policy and program. The problems of the first decade in public administration have not been superseded. Even so old a task as maintaining an adequate street system is still not yet well-enough handled, even in the eighth decade, to satisfy both citizen consumer and professional expert in most large cities of the country. In addition to the old tasks, new problems have been recognized, new functions have been undertaken by government, and new, more complex, interacting programs have been created and must be administered. The ultimate test of public policy and public administration, however, is still execution. It is on realistic programs which are effectively executed that parties, governments, empires, and civilizations stand or fall.

The evolution of concepts and nomenclature has carried through municipal administration, public administration, public affairs, public policy, and the public sector, with a substantial but ill-defined overlapping. Throughout this report the term public administration will be used as the inclusive term—the administration of public affairs through governmental action.

Where Education for Public Administration Stands Today

Education for public administration has developed consistently over the past 60 years in terms of the number of students served, the diversity in programs offered, and the number of institutions granting degrees in public administration or public affairs. A recent survey by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) identified 125 programs in public administration or public affairs at colleges and universities throughout the United States.² During the academic year 1970-71, over 12,000 students were enrolled in programs of public affairs or public administration, and nearly 3,000 degrees, from undergraduate through doctorate, were granted. And enrollment is increasing rapidly. In one year alone, from 1970 to 1971, total enrollment in these programs jumped 23 per cent.³

A wide variety of areas and subjects is offered within these programs or in conjunction with other schools and departments. These include urban administration, planning, public works administration, health services administration, administration of justice, policy analysis, financial management, developmental administration, and many others.

² The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, "Public Affairs and Administration Programs—1971-1972 Survey Report," (Washington, D.C.: The Association, June 1972), p. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 106, Table 3, "Enrollment and Degrees Granted by Degree Program."

The burgeoning enrollments, the diversity of program offerings, and the large number of institutions involved in education for public administration cumulatively represent a critical national asset for the improvement of public programs at all levels of government throughout the United States. As the body of this report will reveal, however, considerably greater potential remains to be realized if the necessary energy is devoted to overcoming several important problems.

One problem is that totally inadequate resources—both public and private—are applied to education for the public service. The need for trained public administrators is made apparent by the increased functions of government and the rise in public employment. This is particularly true in state and local government, where public employment grew from 6,000,000 in 1960 to nearly 10,000,000 in 1970, and is expected to rise to 13,500,000 in 1980.⁴ When Congress recognized a serious public need in the general lack of medical personnel, it responded by appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to supplement medical training and to provide scholarship support for increased thousands of students. Yet no appropriations have been made for Title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which authorized a modest program in training for the public service. Through private and public action schools of business and commerce have been supported and encouraged to the extent that they grant nearly 70 times as many degrees as do their sister programs in public administration.⁵ It is not meant to suggest that society's problems will be solved simply by investing massive funds in education for the public service, or that those who enter the public service without professional degrees in public administration are unable to make significant contributions. The point simply is that, in spite of their best efforts, public administration is unlikely to make significantly greater contributions to the solution of public problems and to the effective management of public programs without a commensurate increase in the resources devoted to public administration training, education, and research.

A second problem facing scholars, teachers, and practitioners in public administration has been the outdated image that those outside of public administration have of the field. Too often, public administration is equated only with the staff functions of personnel, budgeting, and organizational analysis which characterized many graduate programs in public administration 30 years ago. Most programs have progressed beyond that stage, offering a variety of

courses covering the diverse tools and knowledge needed in the wide panorama of public programs today. This diversity, though generally a strength, has been achieved at the cost of consensus.

There is less agreement today than there was 30 or 40 years ago about what constitutes the essential common elements in the professional body of knowledge of public administration.

The question of public administration as a profession and how it relates to the preparation for careers in the public service will be discussed in greater detail later. However, Frederick Mosher's definition of "profession" is applicable . . . "(1) a reasonably clear-cut occupational field, (2) which ordinarily requires higher education at least through the bachelor's level, and (3) which offers a lifetime career to its members."⁶ The failure of the public administration community to agree upon what constitutes professional preparation for public service leads to uncertainty and confusion, which are a handicap to both the academic community and the practitioners in advancing the science and art of public administration.

A third problem is one which has afflicted higher education in general. It is the gradual slide of academic programs away from the relevancy required in meaningful preparation for a profession or occupation. This malady has affected public administration as well as its sister fields. The reward system of most universities is weighted too heavily against applied research, interdisciplinary programs, and faculty participation in (or academic recognition of) continuing education. The result is a relevance gap between academic offerings and the world in which the public administrator must operate. As this report reveals, one sees this most strikingly in many of the departments of political science which house public administration programs in many institutions. It is a problem which must be resolved forcefully if the field is to retain the important thrust from which it originally developed—the effective tying together of education, applied research, and reform-oriented action for the improvement of public programs.

This last problem may be one which can be turned to an advantage by those directors of public administration programs who possess a touch of the entrepreneur and a willingness to innovate.

Some evidence suggests that legislatures, executive agencies, boards of regents, university trustees, and other centers of influence will put increasing pressure upon universities to relate more directly and effectively to the needs of students in preparing for occupations and to contribute to the solution of social and economic problems of the region served by the university. The university structure of governance

⁴ *Manpower Report of the President* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 162-163.

⁵ Unpublished data in the U.S. Office of Education's forthcoming *Earned Degrees Conferred* for the years 1970-71.

⁶ Frederick C. Mosher, *Democracy and the Public Service* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 106.

which rests largely upon faculty and departmental autonomy has ignored, to a considerable extent, the needs proclaimed by students and the public which supports universities when those demands have conflicted with faculty practices.⁷ Frank Newman and his colleagues described the generally feeble response at the graduate level:

Despite considerable public discussion about the role universities must play in meeting our newly perceived social needs, there have been few new types of graduate programs Rather than new fields developing, the traditional ones separate more finely into subdivisions which in time gain the status of new departments

The pressures . . . for interdisciplinary programs have as yet had little effect in terms of the number of graduates. The stranglehold older disciplines have on universities makes it difficult to avoid the deep ruts of conventional study.

Little progress has been made toward another pressing demand on graduate education—to train more doers rather than researchers There has been little shift toward needed curriculum changes, or the addition of external work experiences, or any attempt to teach graduate students the skills and attitudes needed for serving society rather than perpetuating the ingrowth of a professional discipline.⁸

Those who agree with Newman's analysis believe that higher education must re-establish itself with its prime constituencies—both students and the general public, as well as those public officials who legislate or administer programs of support to higher education. Although this view may not have permeated fully to faculty committees and departmental chairmen, it has been recognized widely among university administrators. They are deeply concerned and are pushing several courses of action which clash head-on with the traditional university way of doing things yet which hold promise for meeting important public problems.⁹

There are growing efforts to increase the relevance of university curricula to the occupational needs of students. Much curriculum reform may be little more than weeding out or reducing of courses for which there is little student demand. But there appear to be many genuine efforts, especially in graduate schools, to fit the curriculum to the skills, training, and knowledge needed for employment in meaningful careers.

⁷ Frank Newman, *et al.*, *Report on Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

⁹ This concern is evidenced in the Newman Report, the Carnegie Commission reports, and the meetings and reports of the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and others.

Another trend is recognition of the university's obligation to meet the need for lifetime education. Continuing education has long been ostracized by many in the academic community. The need for meeting this demand is growing strong enough so that university administrators are concerned about how the university can meet this responsibility to prevent it being displaced by other institutions which arise to fill the need.

There is also the greater demand for degree programs which fall outside the traditional resident course requirements, permitting those who work or live too far from universities to commute to earn recognized degrees. More universities are offering such programs than ever, and their popularity augurs well for increasing demand, which, in turn should attract additional resources.

A fourth trend is the growing number of interdisciplinary programs and the recognition within the university of their value and importance in higher education and research. It is generally accepted that most public problems today are of such a nature that no single academic discipline is adequate to make a satisfactory approach, let alone devise a workable solution. The traditional university reward system has not favored interdisciplinary approaches to either teaching or research, but increasing financial support for interdisciplinary programs (especially in view of generally restricted resources at most universities and colleges) may be loosening old practices.

As these trends grow stronger it is likely that, in the allocation of resources provided to universities, priority will be given increasingly to programs directed more toward applied research, interdisciplinary education, and the production of action-oriented graduates. These are areas in which public administration traditionally has been strong. Public administration will receive no favors, but will have to compete with many other claimants for the opportunity to demonstrate the ability to innovate rigorous programs of research and education which will make an important contribution to pressing public problems.

The public administration faculty in the universities, aided by their professional colleagues in government, may well have a singular opportunity to take the lead in revitalizing the universities' relationships with society while improving their own status and resources within the university. This cannot be accomplished without the concerted effort of scholars and practitioners working closely together to improve the capabilities of the public service. This report is a step in that direction for it is concerned with ways to make professional education for public administration more attuned to the needs of today's and tomorrow's public service.

The Focus of the Report

The principal focus of this report is upon the question of what needs to be done to prepare adequately the next generation of public administrators. To answer this question it is necessary to consider what will be the principal challenges to the public service during the coming decade, the current state of graduate education for public administration (which has been the key reference point for most training in public administration), and what the next steps should be.

Part I is concerned with a prospective view of the public service in the United States over the next decade. This look ahead is intended to serve as a guide for examining current efforts to educate people for careers in that public service. Informed thinking about the future, designed to project the developing character of a complex social institution like the public service, is at best difficult and hazardous. This effort to undertake such a forward look has been facilitated by a modified "Delphi" exercise conducted during late 1971. A group of nearly 100 experienced and well-informed leaders in public affairs joined to express their collective views about significant forces for change at work in contemporary American society and their probable impact upon the nature of the public service at all levels of government.¹⁰

Chapters II and III are devoted to identifying briefly some of these current trends for change and how they are likely to affect the public service. This discussion draws heavily upon the product of the Delphi exercise. Since the principal focus is the public service, emphasis has been placed upon trends likely to have a significant direct impact upon the public service and upon the environmental context within which public servants perform. Again reflecting this focus, major attention is given to the changing shape and character of the public service, and lesser attention is given to the causal forces and trends them-

selves. Principal attention is given to estimating the impact of these forces upon four distinct elements of the public service: the organization of executive functions, the public service work force, the administrative process, and the administrator himself.

Part II is a descriptive and evaluative review of the general state of graduate programs in public administration throughout the United States. The review is, admittedly, subjective. It represents observations and judgments based upon material furnished by 43 member institutions of NASPAA and intensive follow-up visits to 16 universities.¹¹ The major questions raised with program directors, faculty, students, and university officials were: (1) What have been the principal achievements of the program?; (2) What are the key problems locally and in graduate public administration programs generally?; (3) What trends do you perceive in curricula, philosophy, and pedagogy?; and (4) What are the most successful innovations? The main concern is how universities are preparing individuals for careers in the public service, and how they are assisting public servants to improve their (and their agencies') capabilities.

Part III of the report advances a series of criteria or guidelines by which to judge graduate programs of public administration in view of what are perceived to be the future needs of the public service. The criteria are also applied to the general nature of current programs to identify relative gaps and deficiencies. Finally, a number of broad proposals are suggested for positive action. The question addressed in Part III of how best to meet the needs of tomorrow's public service was the topic of a three-day Airlie House Conference in July 1972. Some 30 scholars, practitioners, and other public administrators discussed the wide range of issues, problems, opportunities, and challenges facing public administration education. This report has benefited considerably from those discussions.¹²

¹¹ The list of participating institutions constitutes Appendix II.

¹² Those who participated in the Airlie Conference are listed in Appendix III.

¹⁰ The participants and their affiliations are listed in Appendix I.

PART I
THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE 1980'S:
CHALLENGES AND NEEDS

Preceding page blank |

Chapter II

The Changing Character of the Public Service

As with other contemporary institutions in American society, the public service has found the post-World War II decades a time of almost continually accelerating change. One can expect that the 1970's will see significant forces for change at work both in the public service and in the larger social, political, and economic environment within which it functions. Over the next decade the public service will be working in a significantly different context from that of the 1960's. Moreover, it is likely, that in some important dimensions, the functions which the public service is expected to perform and the way in which it carries out these functions also will be subject to change and further development. First, it is appropriate to consider briefly some of the more important trends or forces at work on the contemporary scene which are likely to affect significantly the public service and the way it goes about performing its work.

Forces of Change Affecting the Public Service

The judgments expressed by the informed participants in the Delphi exercise reflected a considerable number of trends and factors influencing the way government at all levels in the United States works to conduct the multiple functions which the people expect it to perform. To illustrate the nature of the complex and dynamic process of change, four broad trends—or clusters of forces—will be described to highlight the kinds of conditioning influences which are challenging the public service today.

Pressures for Centralization and Decentralization

First, consider the countervailing pressures for centralization and for decentralization working within the public sector in the United States today. The pressure for greater centralization is fueled by the demands for national solutions to complex public problems, for national policy determination built upon uniform standards, and the demand for effective control. The counter pressure for increasing decentralization is, in turn, fed by the strong desire to bring government closer to the people, to improve delivery of services, and to bring decision-making centers within reach of citizens most affected by the decisions which are to be made. This is an effort to localize the thrust of government in the United States.

The practice of nationalizing public problems by seeking uniform solutions through the national gov-

ernment has grown apace from the strong beginnings manifested at the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The 19th and 20th centuries witnessed this process of nationalization in foreign affairs and national security, in the promotion and regulation of transportation, in the approach to welfare and the special problems of aging, disability, and poverty; and, more recently, in the nation's tortured efforts to come to grips with civil rights and equal opportunity, especially in education. There is every reason to believe that widespread citizen interests in such issues as consumer rights, environmental protection and improvement, economic well-being, and access to medical care will add further strength to the trend toward seeking national solutions with inevitable reinforcement to centralization within government. The increasing pace of citizen intervention in public decision making, especially in local government, also adds to the pressures for centralization in those policy areas where intractable local conflicts seem to require transfer of the locus of decision to a more distant regional, state, or national level, if a decision—any decision—is to become politically feasible.

The thrust of technology and the kinds of changes in government induced by technical skills, and the adopting of a systems perspective in approaching the whole problem rather than simply a piece of it. The tendency is for responsibility and authority over the design and performance of public programs to be placed at (perhaps remain at is more appropriate) higher levels of government closer to the chief executive. The increasingly complex technology required for information and control functions; the use of temporary project or problem-solving groups which call for sophisticated direction and coordination and which are inevitably less accessible to local political forces—all encourage the drive toward further centralization. In similar fashion the call for greater uniformity in the way government deals with people in order to insure equality, the expansion of legislative oversight of administrative actions, the tendency toward judicialization of administrative decision making as a by-product of citizen intervention—all encourage centralization. Indeed, most developments requiring closer surveillance or reducing flexibility in the administrative process in local, state, or national government simply reinforce pressures for centralization.

But what of the countervailing trend toward decentralization, toward returning public functions to government which is closer to the people? This pressure for more emphasis on local control is not totally

incompatible with the trend toward centralization. The efforts to decentralize converge particularly upon the delivery of services and the collection and analysis of information (including citizen advice and opinion). Thus, both forces may be accommodated by redefining the role of the higher level of government to focus attention upon determining broad policy, defining uniform national standards, program guidelines, and the evaluation of information generated at the level of program execution and service delivery. By contrast, the local government would manage the delivery of services in a unique local area with all the principles of decentralization met by: regular feedback from those receiving the service, opportunity to develop appropriate neighborhood delivery units, and emphasis on fitting quality of service to recipient needs—recognizing the value of diversity in program, policy, and even objectives.

These pressures toward decentralization are reinforced by a number of trends apparent in contemporary American life. For example, the increase in citizen participation in governmental processes, especially pronounced in local government, encourages attempts to decentralize service functions. Revenue sharing, providing federal funds directly to state and local governments, will stimulate further decentralization. Increasing concern over, and experimentation with, ways to organize regionally to cope with the problems of the complex metropolitan areas, the emergence of regional political processes, and regional political leadership all contribute to the growing interest in decentralization. Finally, the progress students of public affairs and public policy are making in developing ways to measure program effectiveness through performance criteria and the continuing experimentation with program evaluation encourage interest in decentralization. In similar fashion the growing attention given to upgrading the quality of state and local government personnel stimulated by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act and by the recent establishment of the National Training and Development Service further encourage the trend toward greater decentralization. Clearly, both of these countervailing pressures—greater centralization and increasing decentralization—will significantly affect the nature of the public service and the environment in which it performs. And both trends are gathering strength.

Unionization in the Public Service

A second major force at work on the contemporary scene is the spread of employee unionism through the public sector, now apparent at all levels of government in the United States. Within the next five to ten years a large majority of clerical and blue collar employees in government probably will be

members of unions and, indeed, many, if not a majority, or those in middle management will be active in labor organizations. Without question this trend will have (in some jurisdictions is already having) a significant impact upon the functioning of the public service. In certain places a professional association rather than an existing trade union has organized employees within an agency and is representing them in discussions with agency management. This suggests that the character of unions and union activity within the public service is likely to vary at least as widely as it does among labor organizations in the private sector. Thus, some unions of public servants undoubtedly will manifest the values, objectives, and patterns of behavior characteristic of militant craft-type unions seeking to limit freedom of managerial decision, control entry into the trade or profession, and press for more emphasis upon seniority and compliance with formal union rules in hiring, promotion, and dismissal. Such approaches are in sharp contrast with the present emphasis upon performance and standard civil service definitions of merit.

On the other hand, there is no basis for assuming that all public service unions will follow such patterns.

It is also important to consider the possible interaction between spreading unionism among public employees and other significant trends at work with important effects upon the public service. Larger and more militant employee unions are likely to reinforce the movement toward centralization noted above. Just as the spread of collective bargaining in the private sector has been a nationalizing force increasing the power of top union leadership and the leadership of an industry-wide bargaining committee, similar results are likely to flow from significantly increased union activity in the public service.

The parallel growth of unionism among government employees and citizen participation in the processes of public decision making poses a double threat to the traditional power and authority of agency managers. If employee union leaders, representatives of the clients whom the agency is intended to serve, and militant public interest groups are all pressing the administrator simultaneously for some action (or inaction), the inevitable result will be to slow down the administrative processes and to force a retreat into more formal rule making through public procedures. The situation is likely to become still more confused by another strong force at work today, the thrust of new technology as it produces continued change in administrative structure and the relevant decision criteria of many government programs. The potential competition for employee loyalty should also be noted. Whereas the public service in the United States has long prided itself for the dedication of public

employees to the public interest (as their agency perceives it), the clear prospect for the 1970's and beyond is for a public servant who must respond to pulls and tugs in at least three directions. Union pressures will be directed toward strengthening the organization, serving the special needs of its members, and extending its influence. Growing pressure on the public servant from his profession is likely also to be at work, designed to encourage behavior which will enhance the stature of the profession and extend its control over vital work processes. Finally, the agency will continue its efforts to build a work force committed to the public service ethic and to its view of the public interest. Spreading unionization and growing professionalization will clearly challenge and eventually change the nature of the public service work force.

Increasing Citizen Involvement

A third force to be examined for its impact on the public service is the trend toward increased citizen participation in public affairs, the phenomenon of citizen activism. The involved citizen is, of course, the ideal of a democratic society. And, according to democratic political theory, is the *sine qua non* of a working democratic political system. Yet the thrust of citizen participation in the United States today goes well beyond this theoretical model of the well-informed, voting citizen. Now citizens are regularly challenging government decision makers about denial of equal rights in employment, about failure to consider all environmental impacts before locating a public facility or granting a private developer the right to proceed, and so on. The growth of consumer power put together through the challenges to government and to large-scale private interests by the public interest lobby, as symbolized by Ralph Nader, has added to the alternatives of citizen participation and built a whole range of new norms and behavior patterns into the conception of citizen activism. There is little doubt that citizen participation in all its ramifications has caught on in the United States and holds out significant potential for influencing the public service of the next decade.

As already noted, the mutually reinforcing thrusts of spreading unionism among public employees and spreading activism among citizens who are clients of public agencies are likely to further politicize the administrative process. Agency managers will, inevitably, become more exposed to pressures, both from outside and from within. A further judicialization of administrative processes can also be expected to flow from these developments since the legal process continues to offer an appropriate weapon to both disaffected agency employees and disgruntled citizens among those affected by its proposed actions. It

should also be noted that, as the process of government decision making becomes further politicized and judicialized, this can alter subtly the role of professionals in the public service. Indeed, these trends can weaken the attractions of the public service as a career field for certain kinds of professionals. Thus the increasing citizen activism may affect the nature of the public service both by modifying the nature of the administrative process and by altering the attractiveness of the public service to competent people.

The Impact of Technological Change

The final major trend to be considered is the force of new, developing technology and the changes in the public service thereby induced. The pervasive influence of past technological developments in American society can be observed readily in both the private and the public sector in the creation of new vocations or career fields—for example, in the area of computer science and automatic data processing—or in the emergence of systems analysis as essential to broad perspectives. Systems analysis appears especially relevant in the public service since so many contemporary issues in American politics involve trying to see the relationships among parts of what is assumed to be a complex, yet single entity.

It has also become incredibly more complicated for public agencies to provide direction, coordination, control, and continuing evaluation of program performance. A systems perspective becomes increasingly relevant if not essential to public managers.

The impact of developing technology affects first the nature of the tasks to be performed and, then, the capacity of public servants to perform these tasks. Thus, today, throughout the public service, increased emphasis is given to the desirability of professionals having a capability in quantitative analytical skills, no matter what professional field is involved. In addition, the increasing complexity of public programs creates a growing need for more managers whose backgrounds are interdisciplinary in character.

Developing technology has reinforced other trends within public administration, loosening up hierarchical organizations, making them more flexible, open systems. In some sense this is a counter pressure to the influences of unionism and citizen activism which lead toward reducing flexibility and discouraging experimentation. With government organizations whose mission is related to developing technology (e.g., the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency), the very structure and operating style of the agency prove conducive to innovation and an open, experimental approach. Working groups have been organized around clearly defined tasks but given only a temporary life, to be broken up and regrouped once the task is per-

formed. The effect upon the whole public service of this experimental approach to organizing and staffing for the accomplishing of specific missions could be profound. Clearly, there is rapid growth within the public service in the use of temporary, problem-solving organizations and project management techniques.

The effect of new technology upon the mix of, and the boundaries between, public and private sector roles in American society is another important consideration with significant implications for the nature of the public service in the 1980's. There is ample evidence that the distinctions between private and public sector are disappearing or becoming increasingly blurred. Private corporations, both profit and not-for-profit, are engaged in performing public functions. The implications for the nature of the public service—mobility between private and public sector, and potential areas of competition—are relevant issues for exploration. And these represent part of the potentially broad set of influences upon the public service which can be traced to the force of new and developing technology.

The Public Service of the 1980's

The significant forces for change at work in American society today suggest the directions of change and the nature of change likely to occur in the public service over the next decade. The impact of these changes will be explored by examining four important dimensions of the public service and how each may be affected by the forces of change identified above—the organization of executive functions, the work force of the public service, the administrative process, and the administrator.

The first concern is how the forces for change currently at work are likely to affect the structure of executive functions, that is, the way executive power and authority are divided and shared among governments and within the executive branch at each level of government. The second area of interest is the probable impact of change on the character of the work force which makes up the public service and the nature of the work environment for career public servants—what will it be like to be a public servant a decade hence? The third area of concern is the effect upon the administrative processes through which government functions at all levels. Here the concern is with the whole range of processes by which public programs are carried out—program development and organization, program execution, program evaluation, and program modification. Finally, an assessment is made about the cumulative impact of all of these changes and developments upon the administrator—the branch chief, division or program director, agency or bureau head. This has been the traditional focus of

public administration: the administrator is the focal point where decisions are made and implemented; program guidance is determined; and policies are reviewed, evaluated, redefined, and ultimately carried into effect. The first three components will be discussed in this chapter. Chapter III will be devoted to the cumulative impact of projected changes upon the role of the administrator.

Organization of Executive Functions

Several of the forces of change within the public service which can be expected to have significant influence upon the structure of executive functions have been reviewed above. Without attempting to separate which important trend is primarily responsible for what particular impact, the probable results of some of these trends certainly are clear.

First, despite dramatic instances of centralizing authority, the general theme is toward flatter organizations with shorter chains of authority but a broader network for providing information and advice—additional consultative and liaison functions. More employees at all levels of government will be engaged in sophisticated data collection and analysis, program evaluation, and similar decision-supporting or participating tasks.

Second, greater use will be made of temporary, ad hoc organizations like task forces and project groups which pull together a small team of specially qualified people to do a job, and who then disband and return to their respective parent organizations or become members of new temporary groups. Such assignments will stimulate creativity and provide a real sense of participation and accomplishment; they also will generate some anxiety about future assignments and will require employees constantly to upgrade their knowledge and skills. Managing an organization made up of such temporary work groups or teams presents challenging problems to the agency leadership—especially problems of balance and control.

Third, the trends toward decentralization and wider participation make the control of public programs more difficult and more complex for top management. The agency director becomes more dependent upon a wider variety of people for information and analysis and faces more points of potential intervention by those outside of the agency (e.g., citizen activists using the courts). There is greater potential for vetoes by citizen groups, or at least delay. But project organization and more structured, rapid systems of communication promise the potential of quicker response once decision is reached. In terms of authority and control, the political executive may be the loser unless he can use citizen interest and intervention as a lever within the bureaucracy. The power of the professional, who will have to be very knowl-

edgeable about the system, may be enhanced considerably. Conversely, there are also influences at work associated with increasing politicization which can have the effect of weakening the influence of professionals.

Fourth, much greater attention will be given to planning at all levels of government. This will include longer-range planning and the more systematic use of forecasting even in social service agencies. New organizations will be needed and closer operating relationships will develop between those responsible for planning and those involved most closely in program execution.

Fifth, accountability will become more difficult because of the much larger number of actors in the advisory-decision process (even though there may be fewer actual decision points), and because of the progressive blurring of public and private enterprise in the planning and conduct of public programs. This will be an especially difficult challenge if financial accounting (especially procurement) legislation is not modernized.

The Public Service Work Force

As used here, the term "work force" designates the people—generally career civilians—who constitute the public service. They include the classified civil service, wage board employees, and members of special systems outside civilian classified service such as public school teachers and administrators, foreign service officers, Public Health Service doctors and nurses, and police and firemen.

One important outcome of the forces currently at work is much greater emphasis upon education in general and upon the development of new skills and knowledge by public employees at all levels. The need for post-entry training and a changing emphasis on particular areas of knowledge in pre-entry education is evident. Increased participation by both citizens and the work force, more centralization in control and information but decentralization in the delivery of services, all call for administrators with considerably improved interpersonal, intergroup, and leadership skills. The increased use of systems analysis and quantitative measurement will require more employees with quantitative skills or with the ability to use the product of such analyses. Both technical and organizational changes will place greater importance on the continuing nature of education—no longer can one complete a degree program in the comfort that it will be sufficient to see one through a decade, much less a full career.

Another change taking place, of great significance to public servants, is the opening up of government organizations to greater opportunity for self-expression and self-actualization with fewer restrictions

upon employees in their roles as public servants. (Politicization of the public service is a counter force which could subject employees to a political discipline, inhibiting their freedom.) Wider participation is opening the public service to currents of opinion and ideas that used to be ignored or considered inappropriate. The public service is beginning to be much more representative of the heterogeneity of American society. The use of project teams and more temporary types of organizations, and better education all broaden the opportunities for members of the work force.

Thirdly, there will be considerably greater mobility in the public service, both within levels of government and between levels. The handful of exchanges so far under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act is a pittance compared to what can be expected. More specific and transferable skills, the use of temporary team groups, project organization and task forces will facilitate movement among agencies or subelements within agencies. The increasingly federated nature of public programs, where control and policy are centralized but whose services are decentralized, will require closer ties among federal, state, and local governments. In order to upgrade state and local capabilities, there will have to be more joint efforts with the federal government and more tapping of federal resources for education. All will tend to promote greater movement of personnel within and among governments.

Furthermore, employees will be more independent on determining what loyalty to their agency requires of them. A better educated work force will not automatically follow agency policy where employees see it as in error, unjust, or unresponsive to the needs of the time. This should prove to be a positive force in the improvement of the public service. To the extent, however, that this rebellion hinges on strictly personal predispositions or on narrow, perhaps professional, self-interest, it can be seriously destructive of the public service by undermining political executives, the legislative process, and public confidence in the ability of the public service to serve the public interest.

As noted earlier, a decline in the public service ethic can be expected if classical unionization sweeps the work force, or if professional and peer loyalties grow stronger than the larger sense of the public interest. So far there appear to be enough government employees who view their work as a trust and as important to the public welfare so that it is possible to continue to use the term public service with some meaning. If there is, indeed, a decline in the public service ethic, the decline probably will carry with it a noticeable reduction in effectiveness.

Once again, increasing pressures toward politicizing the public service will have their direct impact on the work force. Citizen intervention in the administrative process will create strong pressures for employees to become active advocates for or against particular policies or programs. Strong employee unions or professional associations may have the same effect, reducing the neutrality of the government employee in the discharge of his program responsibilities. This can lead to considerable friction within an organization and to action against programs or individuals by legislators and political executives. Politicization will lead to greater conflict, more anxiety, less continuity, and less action.

Finally, as control is shared, accountability will be more difficult to establish. The use of a paper record and elaborate documentation is becoming less useful in the pinpointing of responsibility or accountability. Decentralization, greater citizen and work force participation, more team and group efforts—all point toward the development of a less legalistic concept of accountability.

The Administrative Process

As indicated earlier, the term “administrative process” is used to represent the general process by which public programs are carried out. It subsumes the planning, staffing, budgeting, supervising, delivery of services, information, and other functions of an operating program.

Three tendencies clearly are identifiable—the first two of which are directly at odds: increasing flexibility and increasing rigidity. A number of developments reinforce increasing flexibility: the increase in temporary organizations with better ability to shift resources to meet changing needs, more reliance on state and local governments with greater tolerance of diversity, greater use of private enterprise in performing public services providing more options for the delivery of services, more emphasis on a systems perspective stimulating consideration of more options, and the greater involvement of citizens and more intense focus upon local problems promoting closer responsiveness to citizen-defined needs.

On the other hand, there are a number of developments which tend to promote rigidity more than flexibility, and seem to be operating concurrently with those promoting flexibility. For example, although citizen participation (or intervention) in the administrative process can force a new look at old premises, thereby promoting increased flexibility and responsiveness, it can also politicize the process, bring the intervention of the courts and the legislatures and surround the process with a quasijudicial context—ultimately more rigid and less responsive to change. Unionization could undermine whatever flexibility

now exists in the personnel system and erode management flexibility as well, if the trend typical of industrial unionization is followed. Where employee dissent or citizen intervention reaches a pathological state, the administrative process will be forced into highly structured channels in order to act at all. These two directly contradictory influences can cause unusual tension and conflict because of the varied and independent nature of the forces which support the tendencies. Moreover, the condition is not likely to be uniform, for one pressure may be stronger than the other at varying times and in different organizations.

A third significant influence is that of increasing complexity in the administrative process. It will be more involved as there will be more participants and a heavier representation of those who have played lesser roles in the past—consumers, conservationists, welfare recipients, even prison inmates, plus legislative committees and the courts. The use of sophisticated analyses in program evaluation and planning will demand systematic procedures incorporating a wider variety of skilled people. Greater attention to state and local problems, but from a national perspective and using national resources, will give an intergovernmental cast to more public programs, requiring better liaison and coordination. The blurring of the distinction between private and public enterprise, and the greater use of contractual services to perform public functions, will also contribute to the complexity of the administrative process.

Four changes can be expected to result from the complex of forces at work which will have significant effects upon the future administrative processes. First, new standards for effectiveness and for accountability will be needed. Least cost was displaced some time ago as the all-important criterion for measuring program success. Even “most services for the money” is coming to be considered less than adequate. There is increasing concern about related or secondary impacts of services delivered and the nature of their delivery, as well as the process by which public program decisions are reached.

Second, the administrative process will tend to be much more open—available for observation or participation by a wider variety of people, groups, and institutions. Decision points should be more easily identified. But there will be a tendency for the process to slow down as the number of observers or intervenors increases. As is already becoming the case, it will be easier to block action than to push it through. The processes of participation and intervention will have to be structured carefully in order to preserve their purpose, yet permit timely action.

Third, where complex public issues involve many groups and strongly diverse opinion, there may be a

decline in the ability of the public service to deliver—a drop in its productivity. This could be the price of wider access by both citizens and the work force in the administrative process. The intervention of the courts is also likely to force administrators into the habit, perhaps unconscious, of developing a record which can be used in judicial proceedings.

Fourth, there will be a significant expansion in the planning function tied more closely to and with more

emphasis upon program evaluation and assessment, program execution, and attention to program purposes. This function will cease to be the preserve of a guild primarily of architects, engineers, and economists and require the talents of attorneys, social scientists, and others. There will be greater emphasis upon comprehensiveness, responsiveness to and integration with the practical and political considerations that are part and parcel of program operations.

Chapter III

The Public Administrator of the 1980's

The changing character of the public service over the coming decade forecast in the previous chapter will have tremendous impact upon the individual public servant. The cumulative effect of these developments, trends, and changes will be most notable as they affect the administrator, the man who as agency head, program director, or branch chief traditionally has been expected to make organizations perform—the man on the firing line. His role has been the central focus of public administration—making and implementing decisions, determining program guidance, weighing policy considerations, and executing the ultimate policy. These trends or forces for change affect the individual administrator in terms of: (1) how he leads and directs his agency—that is, intra-agency aspects; (2) how he handles relations with other organizations, other levels of government, the constituency toward which the agency's organic legislation was directed, the public at large, the legislature, the judiciary, and his executive superiors; (3) how he maintains his own competence as well as some sense of direction without becoming submerged in change; and (4) the personal and ethical challenges to him as a professional administrator.

The Public Administrator as Coordinator and Facilitator

The administrator of the future will be more of a moral leader, broker, and coordinator than he will be a boss or issuer of orders. A number of factors will be instrumental in forcing more of a leadership and collegial role upon the administrator than the more classical one of director. Hierarchical authority, based upon position, has been on the decline for several decades as influence or authority based upon position has come to be less and less synonymous with the requisite skills or knowledge associated with points of decision or leadership.

One factor contributing to this changing role of the administrator will be the improved educational background of the work force, tied closely to increased specialization and the rise of authority based upon knowledge and skill. These combine to reinforce the change from emphasis upon directing to emphasis upon coordinating and facilitating activities.

The greater influence and power of employees *vis-a-vis* supervisors could contribute to a more collegial organization. Widespread unionization will give employees stronger organization and can improve their

power to enforce more frequent and more thorough consultation with agency leadership. However, this can also degenerate into a "we" versus "they" situation where much of the work force divorces its interests from the senior officials perceived as management within the organization. In any case, the administrator is less in a position to direct than to lead or coordinate.

Another factor pressing this change in roles will be the increased interdependency within the administrator's organization. Increased applications of technology, the greater use of temporary organizations, and more complex organizations to deal with the great variety of interrelated programs combine to call for an improved capability in meshing specialists in a productive fashion. The fact that specialists will be vital to the agency's operations, that employees or their representatives will exercise more authority within the organization, and that a wide collection of diverse people (frequently without any substantial loyalty to the agency itself) must be orchestrated in order for programs to function, all compel this change in role for the administrator.

The Public Administrator as Bargainer and Politician

The public administrator of the 1980's will be subject to vastly increased political pressures. The institutionalization of citizen intervention in the administrative process will make the administrator's role and his actions more visible publicly, and he will be pressed by citizens and political activists to adopt an advocacy position. This greater visibility, stimulated partly by increased citizen intervention and the broader scope of public programs, will increase the complexity of the public servant's public accountability. In a simpler time the administrator could concern himself with being accountable principally to one or two legislative committees and to a few well-recognized clientele groups. In the future he is more likely to face competing clientele groups and citizen activists working at cross purposes so that he will be measured by different definitions of public accountability. Competing interests necessarily will stimulate increased attention to agency activities on the part of more legislators and their committees, as well as the judiciary when competing interests seek court action to block or stimulate action. The public administrator and his management team must have the capacity to adopt bargaining and political roles if they are to deal suc-

cessfully with the variety of competing interests which may face them.

In addition, administrators in the future will work with a much greater array of organizations than has been true in the past. Increasingly, government programs are cutting across levels of government so that an agency must be able to work effectively, not only with sister organizations, but with counterpart organizations at federal, state, local, or regional levels. Revenue sharing and other trends toward decentralization (as well as the trends toward centralization) will tend to blur what once were considered clear lines of authority and responsibility, so that programs must be cooperative in nature—strengthening the demand for administrative roles of a bargaining and political nature.

The Public Administrator as an Agent of Change

The pace of change, the increased complexity of institutional arrangements, and the decline of traditional ways of successful administration will require the public administrator of the future to be adaptable, knowledgeable about changing trends and new developments, and perceptive in his judgment about which trends to exploit and which to resist or ignore. Personal and organizational relationships will tend to be less permanent than in the past, so that administrators must be able to adapt themselves to constantly changing organizations and shifting personnel. As part of that changing scene, the administrator can reap substantial benefits, as can his subordinates, through increased mobility and the opportunity to learn new skills through new job assignments. Accordingly, he will not be able to rest upon the skills he obtained as an undergraduate or graduate student, nor can he rely upon intuition rather than analysis. There will be greater necessity for planning, forecasting of trends, and evaluation of future alternatives in order to control program performance more adequately. Both technological change and social change will force the administrator constantly to upgrade his own skills, as well as to provide for the necessary time to upgrade his staff. Education increasingly must be viewed as a continuing process, involving informal, personal, and graduate refresher education as an integral part of keeping fit for the job.

Changing skills, new systems of organizing, new program opportunities, and greater emphasis on process will tend to reduce the administrator's tenure in any particular job. Finally, administrators are being encouraged to develop a broader perspective by the widespread use of the systems approach and increasing recognition of the global nature of many public concerns.

Personal Challenges to the Public Administrator of the 1980's

Among the many changes which will significantly affect the public service, several will challenge the public administrator personally as a professional: a decline in the public service ethic, erosion of employee loyalty to his organization, and greater political activism by employees—activism often directed at policy change. In the face of rapid change, increased complexity, and mounting pressure to produce results, these challenges can undermine an administrator's ability to meet, responsibly, more substantive problems by diverting his time and attention.

There is evidence of a number of trends supporting these irritants which tend to undercut the professional nature of the public service and to weaken it institutionally. As part of the Delphi exercise, participants were asked to assess changes which had occurred in key attributes of the public service from 1961 to 1971. The results are not comforting.¹ They reflect the current pessimism of the public about the adequacy of its institutions and its public leadership to deal effectively with major problems. This same broad trend was revealed by the recent study *Hopes and Fears of the American People*.²

Of 12 attributes rated, eight were judged to have improved since 1961. When viewed as a composite, the change was positive (and statistically significant). But all four of the attributes rated as most important in 1961 had declined in 1971:

- "honesty and impartiality in the conduct of assigned responsibilities,"
- "public confidence in the capacity and integrity of the public service,"
- "committed to merit principles in appointments and promotions,"
- "fully responsive to political leadership established by the electorate."

At the very time when one can foresee the need for professional leadership in the public service, the base upon which it and a professional public service must rest appears to be weakening. The public administrator of tomorrow will be sorely tested.

Implications for Educating the Public Servant of the 1980's

The trends portending substantial change and the current mood of doubt regarding the honesty, integrity, impartiality, and responsiveness of the public

¹ See "Attributes of the Public Service: Their Relative Attainment, 1969-71," Appendix IV.

² Albert H. Cantril and Charles W. Roll, Jr., *Hopes and Fears of the American People* (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Associates, 1971).

service combine to present an unusual challenge to those interested in better preparing men and women for careers in the public service of the future. The exercise of peering into the future and the assessment of where the public service stands today suggest several conclusions about what ought to be the concerns of those involved in educating future public administrators—first, with respect to the role of education, and second, the general nature of the skills and knowledge that administrators will need in the future.

It is clear that education must be viewed by administrator and educator alike as a continuing function, necessary both for the maintenance of job competence (and avoidance of skill obsolescence) and for career advancement. Even a graduate degree can no longer assure a young administrator the necessary skill/knowledge base for a successful career without periodic supplementation and reinforcement in a formal educational setting. Pre-entry education (i.e., education prior to entering the profession) in the future probably will have to focus its attention upon three tasks: (1) developing the broad skill and knowledge underpinnings for a career upon which new skills can be built later on, (2) beginning the process of socialization into the profession of public administration, and (3) preparing specifically for the kinds of tasks the administrator can expect during his first three to five years on the job. If this approach is followed for pre-entry education, then post-entry training should concentrate upon skill improvement, new skill accession, and the expansion of perspective.

The kinds of challenges that administrators will face in the future and the context in which they will have to operate suggest three general categories of skill or knowledge in which they should receive preparation—both at the pre-entry and post-entry levels.

First is a thorough understanding of the administrative process. This must include the political process in which it is embedded as well as the impact of regulatory and judicial processes upon it. It should

include intra-agency, interagency, and intergovernmental considerations, and executive-legislative relationships. Case studies of specific program areas or clinical experience, like internships, should give real life context and a grasp of the range of variations in which the administrative process is found—both in its successful applications and in the pathological state.

Second, the administrator must have some minimum base of analytical skills which are both policy and process oriented. The general purpose should be to make him capable of understanding, using, and specifying the products of analysis or research. Few will need the skill to perform detailed, complex analysis themselves. But acquiring the understanding needed by a manager, according to current practice and experience, will take considerable time and effort.

Third, the administrator will have to develop an awareness of and appreciation for, as well as minimum skills in, interpersonal relations, supervision, leadership, and coordination. The administrator must be keenly aware of the nature and intensity of pressures which will be exerted on him and to which he must react by anticipation or by action after the fact. Whether or not there is the time and the appropriate learning environment to develop real facility in these skills if an individual is not already predisposed is an open question. At the very least an administrator should have an awareness of their value, how they relate to his role, and his own relative capability.

The public administrator of the 1980's clearly will have to be well prepared—a person of flexible capability with considerable opportunity for refurbishing his skills and perspectives throughout his career. Based upon the foregoing perspective of future needs of the public service, how well are current institutions anticipating the needs of the public service, and what, if any, institutional changes are required? These are the fundamental questions to which Parts II and III of this report are addressed.

PART II

**THE CURRENT STATE OF EDUCATION
FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE:
ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

Preceding page blank |

Chapter IV

Program Structure: Purpose, Organization, Resources, and Content

The formal structure of a program in public administration reveals a good deal about its goals, its capacity for meeting perceived needs, and the type of product it hopes to turn out. Statements of program purpose in bulletins and brochures show the general direction of emphasis, the type of candidates sought, and the careers for which students will be prepared. The location of the program within the university structure bears testimony to its status on the campus in relation to other academic interests of the university community. It also is a reasonably accurate indicator of the magnitude of financial and faculty resources dedicated to public administration compared with other university activities. In turn, the resources available to the program largely circumscribe its scope and richness. Finally, the curriculum describes what public administration is, substantively, as perceived by the program faculty, while the faculty's approaches to teaching indicate their concept of the context in which public administration is carried out operationally.

Each of these formal aspects of a graduate program of public administration help form an impression of a program's character, its strong points, and its weaknesses. What follows is descriptive generally of several categories of public administration programs, with evaluative comments to suggest relative strengths or weaknesses among categories of programs in general.

Program Purpose

Every graduate program of public administration professes to prepare people for and to contribute to the public service. Traditionally, this has meant preparing students for positions in the career service of local, state, or federal government, or a public international organization like the United Nations and its affiliated agencies. The idea of what constitutes the public service has expanded over the past several decades so that now the term is used frequently to include nonprofit organizations (such as the Urban Institute, The Brookings Institution, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Rand Corporation) which perform research and other services for government agencies, foundations, consumer or citizen interest groups, the so-called public interest groups (such as the International City Management Association, Council of State Governments, National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties), as well as professional associations and those arms of

private industry which have special responsibility for relating to government agencies or corporate public affairs concerns. This concept of the public service is exemplified by the statement of purpose in the bulletin of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University:

Public service . . . extends beyond the formal government into the great variety of quasi-public service, research, and teaching institutions throughout American society. The Program seeks students who put acquired skills to work in helping to influence and shape public policy, and in managing public programs.¹

Although the concept of the public service has expanded, the great majority of graduate programs in public administration remain focused on the preparation of men and women for career positions in government. The activities outside career government service identified with the public service probably will assume greater visibility, but collectively they are likely to represent only a small proportion of the opportunities available in the more important function of public management.

General Goals

Universities tend to be catholic rather than parochial in describing their general goals and the purposes of their programs in public administration. These catalog statements are inclusive of the types of positions, program areas, and levels of government for which the program can prepare the potential candidate. Most pay at least lip service to the concept of providing the candidate with professional training, though few of the programs resemble the highly visible, closely structured, largely autonomous professional schools typical of law or business administration. Most programs in graduate public administration are located in political science departments, and many of those that are not grew out of programs that were once located in these departments. Many aspire to achieve professional school status within their universities and consciously strive, through curriculum design and cooperative arrangements with other depart-

¹ John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, 1971-1972, *Official Register of Harvard University*, Vol. LXVIII, August 19, 1971, No. 14, p. 19.

ments and schools within the university, to provide the breadth and the focus of professional education.²

In spite of the focus upon professional education to prepare students for career service in government agencies, the program statements show great variety in terms of the kind of positions for which students are being prepared. The following excerpts from catalog statements are typical:

The object of the Master of Public Administration degree is to prepare graduate students and mid-career professionals for the changing demands of public service by introducing them to management practices and social science research as they relate to effective and relevant performance in public organizations.³

The Master of Public Administration program . . . is designed to enable students with career interests as public administrators to attain a broad management perspective of public administration The program philosophy includes the belief that some aspects of administrative knowledge and practice are pertinent to careers in both business and government and that all will profit from awareness of both the commonality and the differences.⁴

The MPA program seeks to meet the regional requirements for many additional skilled public administrators as well as to augment the skills of those already in public management.⁵

The objective of the graduate program in public administration . . . is to prepare its master degree candidates for effective participation in public affairs The MPA curriculum is designed for young men and women who seek the knowledge and skills which are requisites for professional achievement as public employees or in such private capacities as consultants. The curriculum combines study in essential areas of administration, economics, and politics with elective concentrations that draw upon a wide range of relevant graduate study fields. Individuals are thus prepared for their initial post-graduate job.⁶

² This is not to suggest that programs located within a department or not having substantial autonomy should be considered "second rate" but only that there appears to be constant movement toward the "ideal" of a separate school or autonomous program which has been one hallmark of the classical professions—law, medicine, theology and, more recently, business administration, education, and public health.

³ School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, *Bulletin*, Spring 1972, p. 4.

⁴ University of Missouri-Kansas City, *General Catalog*, Academic Year 1972-1973, pp. 217-218.

⁵ University of Georgia, public administration program announcement (undated).

⁶ Cornell University Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 1971-72, p. 24.

The graduate programs in public administration are designed for persons preparing for careers in governmental service, research, consulting, and teaching The study of public administration is not considered as training for specific tasks and positions. The curriculum is oriented to the environment of public administration . . . and to the major components of the administrative process⁷

The overriding concern of the Institute's degree programs is to develop professional decision-makers and administrators who will eventually advance to high-level policy making, general management, or consulting positions in the public sector.⁸

The Public Policy Program is the newest part of the Kennedy School. Its aim is to offer new forms of professional education at the graduate level for young men and women who intend to pursue careers marked by elective or appointive public service, broadly defined.⁹

The core of the School is a study program that is intended to enable students:

- to understand major public policy issues facing society;
- to analyze issues with the most sophisticated means available;
- to be sensitive to the political and social contexts of those issues;
- to recommend and select certain alternatives over others;
- to develop and lead organizations in administering programs; and
- to assess the effectiveness of programs in meeting their objectives.

In short, the School seeks to prepare public policy analysts, decision makers, and administrators for influential positions in public service.¹⁰

There are few differences in the broad goals described by these statements of purpose, yet the curricula and institutional specialization vary considerably among these institutions. Most programs of public administration promise to prepare a student for ultimate accession to a position as a public executive—fundamentally an administrative generalist who may, through one or another of available program

⁷ State University of New York at Albany, *Graduate School of Public Affairs Bulletin*, 1971-72, p. 67.

⁸ University of Michigan, *Institute of Public Policy Studies Bulletin*, 1972-73, p. 7.

⁹ John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

¹⁰ School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, *Program Bulletin* 1972-9173, p. 1.

options, acquire some training in a functional or special programmatic area (such as quantitative analysis, public finance, personnel, health services, urban administration, environmental management).

Program Organization Within the University

The organization of a public administration program and its location within the university structure play an important part in determining the nature of the program, its strengths, problems, and viability. However, program organization is not necessarily indicative of the quality of the product produced by the program, nor the commitment or quality of the faculty.

No single, most correct way to organize a graduate program of public administration has emerged that will meet adequately the needs or circumstances of every institution.¹¹ There are four principal variations of organization under which most graduate programs in public administration can be classified: (1) the separate autonomous professional school (such as the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse, and the School of Public Administration at the University of Southern California); (2) the "generic" school of administration, combining in one school public administration, business administration, and, perhaps, others (such as the Graduate School of Administration at the University of California at Irvine, the College of Administrative Science at Ohio State, or the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell); (3) the separate department or institute within a graduate school (such as the Institute of Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan, the Institute of Government Service at Brigham Young University, or the Institute of Public Administration at Pennsylvania State University); and (4) the program within a department of government or a political science department (such as the programs at the University of Kansas, Wayne State University, the University of Georgia, or the University of Oklahoma).

Before dealing with each of these variations, several observations should be made on the significant characteristics and differences among them. First, the recent popular trend toward more emphasis upon policy analysis and quantitative skills had its genesis in those trained in econometrics and, subsequently, is found most frequently in those public administration programs collocated with programs in business administration (or generic schools of administration), though the University of Michigan's Institute of Public Policy Studies was an early leader in this area. It also has found favor in the autonomous professional schools of public administration. This trend has been least noticeable among those programs within politi-

¹¹See the excellent description and analysis on organization of public administration (public policy) programs in John P. Crecine, "University Centers for the Study of Public Policy: Organizational Viability," *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 2 (1971), pp. 7-32.

Pre-entry and Continuing Education

Though the administrative generalist still remains the ideal prototype which most graduate programs of public administration seek to produce, it has long been recognized that only a small minority of those public employees who reach levels of managerial responsibility entered the public service with any training in public administration, to say nothing of the professional degree—the master's degree. Recognizing the need for training at the graduate level in public administration for the many thousands of public servants who did not have the benefit of such education earlier, most program directors announce their intention to serve the needs of public servants at "mid-career." In fact, many programs—particularly state universities and those located in large metropolitan areas—cater to the mid-careerist to the extent that the majority of those enrolled in the master's degree programs in public administration consist of men and women with considerable government experience pursuing their professional degrees on either a full-time or part-time basis.

What is most notably missing in descriptions of programs, their goals and purposes, is the acceptance of responsibility for continuing education in the form of non-degree programs. It is at this point where serious question can be raised about the majority of graduate programs in public administration as to whose interests are being most served—those of the universities or of the public agencies. Although continuing education is widely recognized as a critical need in the public service at all levels—both to upgrade the level of the public service and to avoid obsolescence—the traditional structure and rationale of universities have placed serious obstacles in the path of meeting this need. To some extent this reluctance is reflected in the relatively few differences in entrance requirements and program requirements between those who come directly from college with no work experience and those who enter after some significant experience as a member of the public service. The most notable difference usually is the waiving of any internship requirement. In most instances the public servant returning for graduate degree work in public administration is left to ascertain his own most critical requirements in terms of what the university offers, and then to make as good a match as his time and the schedule of classes permit.

cal science departments, although there has been a trend toward requiring, or at least acknowledging the need for, more course hours in statistical and related analytical techniques. Second, although all programs are moving toward a stronger, more interdisciplinary approach, the separate professional schools and the generic schools of administration clearly are in the lead and have made the greatest progress in the development of interdisciplinary programs. Third, institutional support for the program in terms of identity, resources, faculty, and facilities generally can be rank ordered from high to low beginning with the separate professional schools of public administration, through generic schools, separate institutes, to programs within departments. The visibility and organizational autonomy are determining factors in the relative ease of selection, assignment, and rewarding of faculty—though it is not a satisfactory indicator of faculty effectiveness.^{1 2}

The recent survey of public administration programs by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) revealed that there are four times as many programs organized within government and political science departments as there are in any other category above (nearly 50 per cent of all programs surveyed were located within political science departments).^{1 3} Since the departmental organization represents more graduate public administration programs than any other, it will be discussed first.

Programs Within Political Science Departments

Historically, public administration has been treated as a sub-field within political science, so it has been a natural progression for programs of public administration to take root in departments of political science among faculty members who have a strong interest in the operating problems of government and in preparing students for positions in the public service. Many programs now organized as separate programs of institutes grew from departmental origins. Although political science has been a principal source of disciplinary sustenance for the field of public administration, there has always been at least tacit recognition that

^{1 2} The University of Michigan's Institute of Public Policy Studies stands out as an exception to these general observations. The Institute has been a leader from the beginning in the movement toward more emphasis upon policy analysis. It has pursued an interdisciplinary approach; and it has commanded significant institutional support in terms of identity, resources, faculty, and facilities. Yet the Institute of Public Policy Studies is not a separate, autonomous school nor a generic school of administration. Instead, it is a separate unit within the Graduate School of the University of Michigan. The educational program operates with a faculty holding joint appointments, under the guidance of a committee of faculty members who, except for the Director of the Institute, do not teach in the program.

^{1 3} See NASPAA, *Public Affairs and Administration Programs 1971-72 Survey Report*, Table No. 1, "Organizational Location," p. 105.

political science is not enough. By its nature, public administration is interdisciplinary, requiring the application of skills from a wide range of the traditional academic disciplines. Thus the proper preparation of students for careers in the public service necessitated programs crossing departmental lines in recognition of the interdisciplinary character of public administration through course requirements or options in the degree program. Twenty or 30 years ago this meant stimulating the cooperation of the school of engineering to offer a course in public works management or similar hybrid courses for non-engineers. More recently it has taken the form of courses in statistical methods or information (computer) systems from a school of business administration, courses in public finance or taxation from departments of economics, systems analysis or operations research from an engineering school or a management sciences department, and courses in organizational behavior and small group interaction from departments of psychology, sociology, or schools of business administration.

The key to an effective program organized within a department is faculty commitment. A well-rounded program takes a minimum of two or three respected faculty members who have a strong interest in public administration and are willing to devote considerable personal time and effort to stimulate interest among their colleagues who have the skills needed. Invariably, if the program is successful, the deficit in desired resources to develop and continue a graduate program in public administration is at least partly remedied by the strong commitment of a handful of faculty. The programs inherently contain seeds of instability. They depend, for the most part, upon informal, personal relationships among faculty members across departmental lines. The transfer of a participating faculty member from a cooperating department or a change in his interest can disrupt the program's continuity. However, these hazards do not prevent strong, well-recognized programs from developing and continuing over many years. A good example is the University of Kansas program in urban management. Initiated shortly after World War II, it has survived important faculty changes, the ups and downs of a publicly financed institution, and changing leadership.

A recent trend, which appears to improve the viability of departmentally based programs, is the increasing interest in public affairs (including government operations) by other faculties in social science departments and professional schools—particularly faculties of business, engineering, and law. It appears to be easier than ever to stimulate cooperative interest on the part of these faculties in accepting public administration students in their courses or in the development or modification of courses to meet the needs of public administration students. One cannot

help but be impressed by the number of younger (i.e., under age 40) faculty members jointly conducting classes or doing research with colleagues in other departments or professional schools on major public problems.

A continuing challenge facing those trying to make a success of programs within a departmental structure is the relatively low status accorded to the field of public administration. Usually, though not universally, the research interests of faculty teaching in the public administration program tend to be of a more applied nature and less acceptable as academic research. This tends also to apply to the important related functions of continuing, non-degree education and consulting services for which public administration faculty frequently are called upon. In the faculty "pecking order" these activities are judged to be of lesser importance and tend to put those affiliated with the public administration program at a general disadvantage in the faculty and university reward system. In addition, except where public administration programs have been initiated and supported by the leadership of the department, the public administration faculty tend to be a small minority within the department, frequently out-voted when it comes to budget questions and the assignment of new positions. There is some reason to hope for better status in the future since public administration is one of the few fields among all of the social sciences in which there is currently a strong market demand.

There are a great many variations in organization and emphasis among programs located within departments. For example, the program at the University of Kansas is fully contained within the department in the sense that the majority of the courses are offered by the department, the curriculum is controlled by the department, and the program director is fully responsible to the department chairman for all administrative details including the coordination of internship arrangements. The emphasis is upon full-time study with virtually no relationship to non-degree continuing education programs (except that some of the faculty occasionally are involved in training public officials under the auspices of the University Extension Division).

One finds a considerably different arrangement at the University of Georgia where, although program direction and curriculum are controlled within the Department of Political Science, a good many of the cooperative relationships for teaching courses outside of the department are developed through the Institute of Government, stemming from mutual interests in applied research. The Institute is also responsible for the development and monitoring of internships and the administration of course offerings in the degree program at locations outside of Athens, Georgia.

The Institute of Government provides the opportunity for a close relationship between the degree program and the non-degree continuing education programs in which political science faculty are encouraged to participate.

An example of another variation is the Master of Arts in Public Administration degree program at the University of Oklahoma. The program originally was designed for career administrators who had to undertake the bulk of graduate work on a non-resident basis. (The NASPAA Survey revealed that the University of Oklahoma ranks first in the nation for enrollment in master's degree programs of public affairs and administration.) The Oklahoma program provides for instruction at a dozen different locations throughout the United States and nearly as many overseas. Students are reached through the medium of intensive seminars which consist of a two-month period of individual preparation followed by an intensive six-day course, an examination and a research paper. A substantial number of the faculty are drawn from scholars of recognized reputation in public administration throughout the United States. The program requirements and the curriculum are developed and controlled by the Department of Political Science, but the administration of the program is handled through the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education. The resident program in public administration at the University of Oklahoma grew out of the non-resident program.

These examples suggest that there are many ways in which a university department of political science can respond, if it will, to the perceived needs of the public service for graduate training in public administration, depending upon departmental or university resources, faculty interest, and commitment.

Separate Professional Schools

There are only a handful of separate professional schools of public administration. The NASPAA survey revealed only 15.¹⁴ The professional school of public administration usually is viewed as something of an ideal for public administration programs—primarily because of its attributes of: (1) high visibility; (2) organizational autonomy; (3) separate funding; (4) control over student admissions, program content, degrees; and, (5) discretion in the selection, hiring, and recommendation for promotion of faculty. The constant struggle in the competition for funds and faculty is raised to the level of the graduate school or the university at large where broader considerations than departmental interests prevail, and where the influence of clientele groups can be brought to bear more effectively.

¹⁴ NASPAA, *op. cit.*, Table 1, "Organizational Location," p. 105.

The relative autonomy of the separate professional school, combined with its organizational visibility, aids in promoting a greater unity among the faculty of the public administration program, facilitating the development of a cohesiveness and a sense of identity among students in the program to a larger extent than is likely within other organizational contexts. Another advantage is the relatively greater bargaining power that public administration is able to bring to bear in discussions with other schools and departments for joint or cooperative programs in teaching and research.

It also stimulates the development of joint programs, particularly with other professional schools such as law and medicine, and increasingly with public health and planning. Joint degree programs are available or are being developed at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School, Syracuse's Maxwell School, Minnesota's School of Public Affairs, and USC's School of Public Administration, among others.

Although the professional schools of public administration share the attributes described above, they differ widely in how they are organized, including their components. For example, the School of Public Administration at the University of Southern California is one of the largest and the second oldest (founded in 1929) among schools of public administration in the country. In 1967 it was incorporated within the framework of the von Kleinsmid Center for International and Public Affairs. In addition to the School of Public Administration, the Center includes a School of Politics and International Relations, and a Graduate Program of Urban and Regional Planning. Generally, faculty are appointed to the School although there is some sharing of faculty within the Center and between the School and other elements of the University (such as the School of Medicine). The School carries out a series of programs in continuing education and research through several special institutes at the Civic Center Campus in downtown Los Angeles and other off-campus sites in Southern California.

A different organizational context can be found at Syracuse's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. Although the Maxwell School has been popularly viewed as synonymous with public administration, the School contains all of the social science departments at Syracuse University except psychology (anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, and sociology). Although there is no department of public administration, the dean of the Maxwell School historically has been the *de facto* leader of the public administration programs. Interdepartmental cooperation within the School thus has

been more or less assured and accepted as a matter of course. The Maxwell School is the oldest university based professional school of public administration in the nation (founded in 1924).

The Graduate School of Public Affairs at the State University of New York (Albany) has some of the same organizational characteristics as the Maxwell School in that GSPA contains the Department of Political Science, the Department of Public Administration, and the Program in Political Economy. As in the Maxwell School, the Graduate School of Public Affairs at Albany has been associated closely with public administration, so that interdepartmental cooperation within the School is, perhaps, more easily facilitated than where departments of political science and economics are separated organizationally from the professional program in public administration.

Another organizational variation is that found at the School of Public Affairs of the University of Minnesota. For the most part, faculty are appointed directly to the School, conducting their teaching duties there, although students from other departments and Schools are accepted in the courses of the School of Public Affairs. There is some sharing of faculty to teach particular courses, such as from the Department of Political Science. Joint research also is conducted with faculty from other components within the University. The School is an independent component within the Graduate School of the University. The Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington is organized along a similar pattern.

The Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University represents another organizational variation. The School originally was established in 1935, and until 1966 was known as the Graduate School of Public Administration. The Kennedy School has three principal components: the Public Policy Program, which is an interdisciplinary program leading to a master's or doctor's degree in public policy and which may be taken in conjunction with other professional degrees; the Mid-Career Program, designed for government officials and culminating in a master's or doctor's degree in public administration; and the Institute of Politics, which serves as a focal point for study and research in politics and policy problems of the government, largely catering to undergraduates. Some faculty are appointed to the Kennedy School, but most who teach in the School hold primary appointments in the Departments of Economics and Government of the faculty of arts and sciences, and in the faculties of law, business, education, medicine, public health, and in the natural sciences and engineering.

Combined Programs—Public Administration and Other Programs

The principal organizing concept where public administration is combined with business administration, educational administration, public health administration, or others is the belief that there is a common core of knowledge in management, analytical tools, economics, and organizational theory which makes it both practical and stimulating to join these programs. The general pattern is for an "umbrella" school to be formed with a single faculty (in terms of appointment), but with the faculty and students assigned to divisions which represent their broad areas of interests—i.e., public, business, or some other area of administration. The faculty is interdisciplinary, and one will find management scientists, psychologists, sociologists, economists, and political scientists. There is a tendency to assign faculty members with degrees in public administration or political science to a public administration division and those with degrees in business or economics to a division of business administration.

A series of common courses usually is required. This type of program organization has the economic advantage of sharing those courses considered common to a variety of management careers, plus the advantage of making available unique faculty resources which more traditional departmental lines might preclude. The principal disadvantages are the difficulty of meeting the educational needs of students preparing for quite different careers, and a lack of vocational identity among students. Compared with the separate professional schools of public administration, there is considerably less cohesiveness among the faculty of a combined school, although there usually is an informal grouping within each division. It is not unusual for public administration to come off second best in these arrangements, especially where a newly developed program of public administration has been joined to a well-established school of business administration. Most of the core courses tend to be taught by members of the faculty with a business administration perspective, and many of the critical differences between the environments of public and private management appear to be lost.

The trend in combined programs is the development of a generic school, such as a college of administrative sciences. Such arrangements have had little time for extensive testing in terms of their effectiveness. But thus far none appears to have been as effective as the separate professional schools of public administration in achieving prominence in public administration or in the relative success of their graduates in the public service.

Separately Identified Institutes

The organization of programs in separately identified institutes can be characterized as being somewhere between programs located within political science departments and the independent professional schools. One example is the Institute of Government Service at Brigham Young University. The Institute was established in 1961 and operates under the aegis of the College of Social Sciences. It is regarded neither as a department of the University nor as a separate school or college. It relies upon faculty from other departments and schools—accounting, business administration, organization behavior, and statistics. All participate although political science is most heavily involved. It offers only the MPA degree. The Institute has responsibility for its curriculum, the content and development of its courses, and the scheduling of its classes. As might be expected, this arrangement whereby a faculty member conducts classes in one organization but must rely upon his standing and recognition within another home department for the traditional academic rewards, is viewed as less than fully satisfactory for either the faculty or the program.

Another example of this type of organization is the Institute of Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan. The Institute was formed in 1968, growing out of the Institute of Public Administration. Officially, it is a university research unit funded by the University for that purpose, and is not a teaching department. However, it has the responsibility for administering graduate programs in public policy and public administration. It is governed by an Executive Committee reporting directly to the University vice president for academic affairs. The dean of the Graduate School is chairman of the Executive Committee, with the director of the Institute as an ex officio member, and senior faculty members from economics, business administration, and industrial engineering completing the group. Thus, the Institute is interdepartmental, and interdisciplinary, with the teaching staff holding appointments in the traditional academic departments. A group of associated faculty give courses that are selected frequently by students pursuing the master of public policy degree. Those faculty teaching in the Institute are paid by the Institute, and the Institute controls its own curriculum.

The separate identification and funding of an institute give it greater flexibility—particularly in attracting an interdisciplinary faculty—when compared with a program based solely within a department of political science. It is also possible to exercise some greater choice and leverage in the selection of faculty to teach in the institute when the institute is able to "buy" a considerable amount of time from such faculty. This tends to relieve the financial pressures on

the departments and opens broader opportunities for their faculty. The institute also represents a common meeting ground for faculty of diverse academic background for developing or reinforcing their interests in public administration.

Program Resources

Graduate programs in public administration, when judged against the criteria of needs and opportunities, generally receive inadequate resources in terms of funding, faculty positions and promotion, fellowship support, and facilities. For example, the NASPAA survey revealed the small size of faculties involved in public administration programs. Of the programs surveyed, half had four or fewer full-time equivalent faculty members, and eight programs accounted for 38 percent of the total full-time equivalent public administration faculty.¹⁵ A critical determinant is the relative financial position of the university in which the program is located. Although there is wide variation when one compares public administration programs across universities, and their relative support within the university, some generalization is possible. The combined schools of business and public administration (including the generic schools of administration) appear to be best endowed, as a group. However, the public administration portion of these schools usually is least favored. Separate schools of public administration are next best situated, although the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, with its special endowment, is supported at least as well as any of the generic or combined schools. Separately identified institutes follow the separate schools in terms of resources. Programs located within departments are least well supported. Most directors of programs located within departments must live by their wits and the commitment and good humor of faculty colleagues who are interested in preparing students for the public service.

The strength of a particular program cannot be judged solely by its budget or the number of faculty assigned. Rather, there appears to be a synergistic relationship among four sources of program support—some or all of which may have a strong influence on a particular program. These sources are: (1) the support and status of the program within the university, (2) the support by clientele groups and others outside of the university, (3) faculty commitment and entrepreneurial skill, and (4) the quality and enthusiasm of the students attracted to the program.

Support and Status Within the University

Perhaps the most visible measure of program support is the status of the program within the university

¹⁵ NASPAA, *op. cit.*, Table 16B, "Distribution of Faculty by Quartiles," p. 110.

and the resources assigned to it. University support in terms of resources and program status are not always coterminous. Historical factors and characteristics unique to a particular program and its university setting may play a determining role in the discrepancy between status and resource support.

In new programs, such as those developed in recent years at the University of California (Riverside and Irvine), Ohio State University, and the University of Minnesota, the allocation of funds and faculty positions for the development of a program have been relatively generous. For these programs, status within the university is more closely linked to favored treatment by the university administration based upon future expectations than it is to past program performance. The older, well-established programs usually enjoy a relatively high status in the university based upon performance over a period of many years. Few programs have achieved high status in terms of scholarly accomplishment judged by the university community—at least partly because of the applied nature of public administration, its interdisciplinary character, and the fact that its educational objectives diverge from the purposes of the principal disciplines in preparing its students to enter the world of government service rather than the world of the scholar.

Support by Clientele Groups and Others Outside of the University

A principal source of pressure for the allocation of increased resources to programs of public administration is the clientele group outside the university. Frequently these are highly placed practitioners in local, state, or federal government, or prominent members of university trustees and governing boards who see a strong need for improving the public service through graduate training in public administration. These groups can be instrumental in the establishment of a program and in performing a watchdog function to assure that such programs, once established, continue to receive resources. The new program in public administration at Ohio State University and the new School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota can be traced to the recognition by the governing boards of these institutions of the need for improved graduate training in public administration and public affairs. Location of the university in a state capital adds to the program's visibility and potential support. Similarly, the graduate program in public administration at the University of Georgia largely resulted from the interest of local and state officials, combined with faculty initiative and the support of the university leadership.

Once a program is established, successful alumni reinforce the interest of clientele groups and may constitute an extra-university source of financial sup-

port. This is especially valuable to private institutions, but has been exploited successfully by state institutions as well. The alumni networks of such programs as the School of Public Administration at USC, Harvard's Kennedy School, Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School, Syracuse's Maxwell School, and the University of Kansas all are evidence of the strength and value of this support.

Faculty Commitment and Entrepreneurial Skill

More than any other element, it is the combination of faculty commitment and their entrepreneurial skill which sustains the majority of graduate programs in public administration. Most public administration faculty have heavy teaching and counseling loads compared with their colleagues in political science or other departments. Of course, there are some exceptions in universities of great reputation, such as Harvard and Princeton, or in the newly established schools where faculty resources have been developed more rapidly than student enrollment. The most striking thing about the public administration faculty is their outstanding commitment to their programs in terms of teaching, student guidance, and research. They tend to display an excitement and a quest for innovation that is stimulating both to the students in the program and to their colleagues. Considerable effort is devoted to developing new courses, new course material, and the planning and execution of team teaching and other pedagogical techniques. Although the majority of public administration faculty comes from backgrounds in political science, they are distinctly interdisciplinary in outlook and reflect a varied combination of academic training and work experience. Faculty are drawn from economics and the other social sciences, from the physical and natural sciences, and from engineering. Much of the financial support for students and most of the opportunities for internships are the result of assiduous faculty cultivation.

For all of their commitment and expenditure of energy toward the program faculty tend to overlook a valuable resource available in some measure in virtually every program. That is the mid-career practitioner who has returned as a student, or the government official, locally available, who would welcome some active participation in the teaching program. Too frequently these practitioner resources are overlooked or inadequately used.

They provide an opportunity for adding both the perspective and the dynamic immediacy of administration from the world of practice.

The Students

Ultimately, good students are the life blood of a successful program. There is increasing emphasis in all

programs upon selecting high-quality candidates. The review of applicants includes a thorough analysis of transcripts, statements of purpose, letters of reference, and test scores, though most schools will make allowances for lower than desirable test scores of applicants with offsetting strengths or from minority groups. Increasingly, schools are seeking personal interviews as one means of evaluating candidates. More attention is being given to applicants who have some work experience, whether that experience is in government or elsewhere. Nearly every program seeks to put together classes which will produce a mix of disciplines and experience, although political science remains the predominant undergraduate degree of entering students.

Historically, programs of public administration frequently have been judged by sister departments and schools as attracting academically second-rate students who are less qualified academically than most graduate students in the social sciences, though some schools consistently have attracted students who are superior by any standard. In those schools where business administration and public administration are located together, business students usually have been rated higher academically, based upon their test scores and more rigorous (i.e., mathematically oriented) undergraduate records. The image of public administration is changing, however. Increasingly, students accepted in graduate programs of public administration or public affairs are competitive in academic credentials with their peers in other professional graduate programs. Experience shows that their classroom performance is rated as equal to or better than other graduate students, and that their motivation is superior. Senior university administrators concede that graduate programs of public administration, as a group, are attracting more and better qualified students compared with graduate programs in the other social sciences, engineering, physical sciences, and business administration. The higher the caliber of students and the more enthusiastic and committed the students are, the more highly will the program be regarded, and, ultimately, the stronger will be the support of alumni and clientele groups in the competition for more university resources.

Program Content and the Curriculum

Judging by the degree requirements and the content of public administration programs, there is considerable variation of opinion about what constitutes appropriate preparation for the public service. The period of time in residence, examination and thesis requirements, and specific course requirements vary widely. So do options for specialization, the teaching methods employed, and the nature and length of in-

ternship offered. In spite of these variations, there are points upon which most program directors agree. First, the completion of degree requirements at the master's level represents qualification as a professional for those pursuing a career as a practitioner. The Master of Public Administration (MPA) is the degree most offered in this professional sense, with the new public affairs and public policy schools offering a Master of Public Policy or Master of Arts in Public Affairs. Second, in terms of curriculum content, students need some minimum analytical skills, a broad grasp of the management functions, an understanding of human behavior in modern organizations, and comprehension of financial management. Third, some type of practical experience is considered desirable, whether obtained through actually working in a government or public policy oriented agency or in conducting research on a real problem. Fourth, in terms of pedagogical technique, there is a tendency to depend less on classical lecture or seminar presentations in favor of more stimulating, participative methods. Fifth, considerable effort needs to be expended in making programs more relevant to the kinds of challenges and problems facing the public service. This involves the need to update teaching materials, provide opportunities for interchange with practitioners, and develop a laboratory setting for learning.

General Requirements

Most programs offering a master's degree require the equivalent of full-time study for three semesters, or approximately 18 months.¹⁶ Historically, there has been a trend toward requiring more credit hours to complete the master's degree and, thus, lengthening the time a student must devote to full-time study or to an internship assignment. Most program directors and faculty believe that a one-year program is inadequate to cover the knowledge and skills necessary for an entering professional, though the individual at mid-career usually can complete the necessary course work within an academic year.

Like most other programs preparing individuals for a professional career, fewer and fewer public administration programs require a thesis. However, there is still a recognized need for some vehicle through which the student can demonstrate his ability to research a significant problem and present his findings clearly and coherently in written form. Where a thesis is no longer required, students must develop a research or policy analysis paper of extended length, which may be linked directly to an internship or practicum, or reflect team projects on actual public policy problems. Both students and faculty tend to view

such a research or policy paper requirement as more relevant to the role of the professional practitioner than the traditional graduate thesis.¹⁷

Comprehensive examinations, like the thesis requirement, are less likely to be found today than ten years ago. However, two-thirds of those institutions responding to the NASPAA survey still require some type of comprehensive examination—some of which are written and oral, and others which are oral only and centered upon a research or policy paper.¹⁸ Some institutions are attempting to develop performance examinations, particularly in connection with quantitative and policy analysis skills, as a partial surrogate for a professional certifying process which does not yet exist in the field of public administration. Some program directors justify the comprehensive written examination as a means to unify, through the student's performance, the separate elements of knowledge that he has acquired in individual courses.

Core Curriculum and Program Options

The most pronounced shift in public administration curricula in recent years has been the increased attention to public policy analysis. It is characterized by heavy emphasis upon the development and evaluation of program alternatives, the decision-making process, and the key points of leverage in the decision process. Its principal method is systems analysis, heavily grounded in economic and quantitative techniques. Students necessarily must develop some minimum competence in mathematical and statistical manipulation, computer operations, and macro- and micro-economic analysis before they can subject specific public policy problems to their own laboratory exercises. Thus, the policy analysis type of program usually requires two academic years, the first of which is spent mostly in acquiring the necessary tools of analysis. Some of the institutions which have been pursuing this route are the Institute of Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan, the Kennedy School at Harvard, the College of Administrative Science at Ohio State University, the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon University, the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, the School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, and the Graduate School of Administration at the University of California (Irvine). The heavy emphasis on quantitative methods as part of the core curriculum is typical of those schools where public administration and business administration are combined.

¹⁶NASPAA, *op. cit.*, Table 12, "Time to Complete Master's Program," p. 109. Seventy per cent of the programs surveyed required more than 12 months to complete the master's degree requirements.

¹⁷According to the NASPAA survey, only 40 percent of the programs still have a thesis requirement, Table 9, "PA/A Program Requirements," p. 108.

¹⁸*Ibid.*

Most programs in public administration have continued a primary emphasis on public management (including the classic functions of organization, financial management, and personnel management) and an increasing emphasis on organizational behavior and interpersonal relations as key elements in any government organization.

There are two schools of thought about required courses for programs in public administration. One is that there is a considerable body of knowledge and skills that *every* administrator should have irrespective of level of government, function, or substantive program interest. Following this philosophy may result in as much as 75 per cent of a two-year program being devoted to required courses. A second philosophy is that there are very broad areas in which students should prepare themselves, but that the designation of specific courses as required detracts from the opportunity for student self-development. Here the emphasis is upon individually tailored programs based on mutual diagnosis by the student in cooperation with an experienced faculty counselor. This philosophy results in only a handful of required core courses and, in some instances, in no specific required courses but the requirement for the selection of courses from core areas. An example of the latter is the School of Administration at the University of Missouri, Kansas City, where no *specific* courses are required for the MPA degree. The candidate must complete a total of 36 credit hours, including 27 hours selected from a list of courses approved by the faculty, plus nine hours proposed by the student.

Generally, required courses constitute about one-third to one-half of the semester or quarter hours necessary for the MPA degree. The bulk of these required courses are scheduled during the first year, often in some sequential scheme. Sequence is of greatest importance to policy analysis programs, since students must achieve a minimum level of competence in the various quantitative techniques before making extensive application. The most commonly required courses are statistics, economic analysis, organization theory, administrative behavior, and financial management. Frequently students are required to take a general public policy or problems in public administration seminar where some attempt is made to provide general perspective.

There has been a substantial increase in emphasis upon quantitative and analytical skills in all graduate programs of public administration. But there is great variation in both the depth in which these skills are covered and the prerequisites needed to take the courses. Several policy analysis programs seek applicants with mathematical skills equivalent to calculus, or require non-credit catchup courses to bring students up to the entry level skill expected. Faculty in

virtually all of the policy analysis programs report difficulty developing appropriate course material and obtaining faculty who have both the analytical competence *and* an understanding of public policy processes. Only a few of the policy analysis programs have as their purpose the development of highly skilled policy analysts or technicians. Most seek to develop enough skill so that students can make effective use of the products of analysis in management and can specify problems for analysis. Considerable development and experimentation remains to be done if this latter goal is to be achieved.

Although some programs focus attention on self-awareness and the development of interpersonal skills (such as the School of Public Administration at the University of Southern California), courses in executive leadership or supervision are not much in evidence. The general area of public management, where the emphasis is upon program organization and execution, has been de-emphasized, and frequently appears to be lacking in those programs with a heavy emphasis upon quantitative analysis.

Compared to 20 years ago, there has been a vast expansion of program options for the student of public administration. Most programs provide the opportunity for a student to take at least three or more courses in an area of special interest to him. For example, a student may wish to specialize in a staff functional area such as financial management, planning, management sciences, personnel management, or information systems and data processing. Or he may wish to concentrate upon a program specialty such as human resource administration, urban management, penology, or development administration. The types of options vary with the resources available to any particular university and the cooperative arrangements which reach across departmental and school lines. Such program offerings frequently are available in the form of courses which are cross-listed or treated as electives and available elsewhere within the university.

Some options for specialization are part of a program's standard offerings, such as urban, state, or national government management, judicial administration, administration of aging programs, or health services administration.

Most programs offer some flexibility in bypassing requirements which duplicate competence or knowledge that the student may already have, or which seem unnecessary in preparing a student for a particular career. Requirements may be waived on the basis of a performance examination or satisfactory achievement in previous course work. This approach is most frequently applied to quantitative and analytical tool courses. Several programs have separate "tracks" for the quantitative type courses, such as statistics or

macro- or micro-economic analysis, depending upon the level of skill of the student at the time he enters the program and the type of career for which he is preparing.

Pedagogical Techniques

There is considerable interest and experimentation with course scheduling, teaching methods, course material, and adjustments for individual student needs or capabilities. For example, several institutions have tried arrangements other than the traditional quarter or semester-long courses, replacing them with courses of greater intensity and shorter duration. In most instances where this has been tried it represents an attempt to be responsive to practitioners who wish to enter degree programs, but who have limited time to devote to resident courses and who are physically too distant from the university to commute on a part-time basis. Both the University of Oklahoma and the University of Southern California offer these intensive courses. The students are mailed reading and other preparatory materials several months in advance of the actual meeting of the class. The class consists of a series of lectures, seminars, and student exercises over a period of six to ten days during which students are engaged actively for as much as 12 hours per day. Typically, the intensive period of class work is followed by an examination, paper, or research project.

A somewhat different type of intensive course has been offered for several decades at Syracuse's Maxwell School through its "Program I." Students are in residence full time as are those who are taking their courses on a regular semester schedule; however, the Program I students take their courses one at a time, concentrating solely on that particular subject for periods of from two weeks to a month. This particular approach is designed to provide both deep immersion in the subject and to give students experience in the operational pressures of having to meet short deadlines under adverse conditions.

Schools are increasing their interest in team teaching. Two or more faculty work together to develop more fully an interdisciplinary perspective that is inherent in public management and policy problems. Most of the public administration programs that emphasize the policy analysis approach use some version of team teaching. This may involve the joint participation of two or three faculty members in a series of classes where each addresses a particular problem, or it may be limited to consecutive appearances of different faculty discussing a common topic. A few schools, such as the University of California (Berkeley), the University of Minnesota, Harvard, Ohio State, and Princeton have invested considerable faculty time in the development and planning of courses in order to present a fully integrated program, draw-

ing upon the different training and perspectives of the faculty involved—a considerable step beyond each faculty member giving his own, individual presentation.

Team teaching has a great deal to offer, but is difficult and expensive in terms of faculty time. Much of what passes for team teaching still suffers from a lack of true integration, because there has been insufficient planning, well in advance, by the participating faculty. Team teaching seems to be employed most often in those courses designed to apply analytic skills.

Considerable effort is being expended by faculty throughout the country in relating techniques and skills recently developed in research to current problems in a context which students can understand and appreciate. Thus one finds that courses focusing upon policy analysis, substantive policy areas, interpersonal relations, and organizational development tend to be given in a laboratory setting more often than through traditional lecture or seminar methods. Actual problems are addressed, analyses are performed, data are collected and processed, and students participate in various types of role playing. Management games, both paper and pencil versions, and computerized, are becoming popular. Faculty have proved ingenious in modifying commercially available management games or developing their own. Students are being given more opportunities to participate directly in the learning process, rather than absorbing knowledge passively. Computer applications and information systems have been introduced to students in such a manner as to give them the opportunity to manipulate the computer very early in the course without having to spend a semester learning a vast technical lexicon of computer programming language.

Given the increasing trend toward laboratory types of courses, there is a dearth of needed course materials, such as case studies and realistic laboratory exercises. New case studies are needed which are based upon actual problems or issues in government and which reveal the dynamics and the constraints involved. The increased attention to complicated policy analysis has not displaced the continuing need for short, pointed examples of the human and institutional relationships, foibles, opportunities, and restrictions that case studies can provide, if properly prepared and used. There also is the need for faculty to become more adept at using case material. Laboratory exercises for the application of quantitative skills in policy or program analysis take a great deal of time and ingenuity to construct, especially if they are patterned after real problems or are, in fact, concerned with current policy problems. Some lip service has been paid to the interinstitutional sharing of such exercises, but no extensive cooperative network has

developed to make these exercises more widely available—even among those programs where the emphasis is upon policy analysis. Some institutional framework for cooperation seems needed—perhaps similar to the efforts which originally led to establishment of the Inter-university Case Program.

The Practicum or Internship

A practicum can be defined as student work on a research problem, frequently one of current interest to a public organization, undertaken under the supervision of a faculty member. The research may take place within the agency where the agency acts as sponsor, or the researcher may be given limited access to agency personnel and files. The internship, on the other hand, represents a job assignment within a government agency or public policy oriented organization such as a council of governments, a community action organization, or a public interest association. Both the practicum and the internship may be pursued on a full-time or a part-time basis depending upon the time the student has available, his past work experience, and the sequence of his class schedule.

Internships vary in duration from the summer between two academic years (which is most frequent in the two-year programs) to a full year of practitioner experience, as required in the urban management option at the University of Kansas. The majority of internships range from three to six months in duration. Ideally, internships are paid positions where the agency accepting the intern employs him on a temporary basis, paying at least a minimum salary. Such arrangements recently have become more difficult to arrange as local, state, and federal government agencies have faced tighter budgets for personnel and freezes on hiring. Occasionally an institution, such as Princeton, will provide a stipend for those internship positions where the organization is unable to pay a reasonable salary. Other internships, particularly those which are part-time in nature, are unpaid.

An internship is required by the majority of public administration programs, and the other programs encourage or recommend such work experience.¹⁹ Most program directors, faculty, and students believe that internships are valuable for those students who have not had previous government experience. The internship provides the student, at least in the microcosm, with the personal experience of having to face problems, make decisions, and produce within a bureaucratic setting. It helps him to better understand and relate the classroom and laboratory knowledge gained in the program course work. It provides insight into the relationships, attitudes and values which are part of an organization's culture. It is also especially valued by students as an inside means from which to scout

for a more permanent position following the completion of their degree work. This is important during a period of tight employment.

The practicum tends to be favored more in those programs emphasizing policy analysis, since this type of practical exercise is valuable in testing and exercising the student's competence to plan and to apply analytical techniques. It is easier than the internship to pursue on a part-time basis. The practicum serves as a substitute for an internship where the latter cannot be arranged.

Both the practicum and the internship must be planned carefully and tailored to the individual student's program goals. Frequently, the practicum can be integrated into a faculty member's short- or mid-range research, further assuring adequate faculty supervision and planning. Obviously, make-work exercises, in the guise of a practicum or an internship, can be more destructive than useful.

The internship has a longer history than the practicum in graduate programs of public administration and remains a favored device for giving the student some experience and practical insight into public administration. Unfortunately, few internships are either adequately organized or carefully supervised. One finds that, in practice, students must do much of the arranging themselves, and are fortunate to find an assignment which provides meaningful work or a satisfying learning experience. However, students who criticize their own experience with an internship acknowledge that even a poor internship is an advantage to a student, and probably worthwhile even though he was unable to make best use of his time. The most common deficiency in both the practicum and internships as they are carried out is the inadequate faculty resources assigned to their planning and supervision. Both require considerable investment of time: (1) to develop the liaison with public officials that will result in identifying good opportunities where the student can learn by doing as well as by observation, and (2) in adequate supervision of the intern on the job.

A second weakness in the way that internships are conducted is the failure of the faculty to exploit the student's intern experience in his course work. Too frequently the internship experience stands alone. The courses preceding it prepare the student only minimally to take advantage of the experience, and those which follow it fail to draw systematically upon his experience as a key element in the learning process.

In spite of the obvious difficulties in establishing good internships and the relatively tight job market which make the identification of internship opportunities more difficult, there is little evidence to suggest that the internship, as a part of public administration programs, is going to decline in importance.

¹⁹ NASPAA, *op. cit.*, Table 9, p. 108.

Continuing Education

In the most inclusive sense of the term, continuing education includes all course work or training taken by an individual after having entered his vocational career. This covers the practitioner taking night classes toward a graduate degree, the mid-career official who returns to the university on a leave of absence to pursue full-time graduate work, and the public official engaging in one of the many short courses whose duration may be from one or two days to eight to ten weeks. More typically, universities tend to reserve the term "continuing education" to cover non-degree programs. With rare exception, these are kept distinctly separate from the academic departments or the graduate schools and made the responsibility of a special university division or extension service, the status of which is barely above that of the university maintenance force. There are important exceptions to this generalization, and public administration faculties appear to be less prone to downgrade continuing education than are faculty members in the traditional academic departments. Yet, public administration programs also tend to maintain an arm's length relationship with that element in the university responsible for continuing education as it relates to training public officials.

This state of affairs is particularly unfortunate because non-degree continuing education provides valuable opportunities for faculty to: (1) make contacts and develop mutually useful ties with members of the practitioner community, and (2) exchange views with practitioners on current problems and issues that have immediate and direct transfer value to the classroom where students are being prepared for entry into the public service. Even where there is a will, it is difficult to integrate, institutionally, the function of continuing education into the regular graduate degree program in public administration because of the condescending attitude of university faculty generally toward non-degree programs. Continuing education activities appear to be most successful when tied closely to the faculty and the administration of a public administration program. At Ohio State University this tie has been made institutionally in the program through a Division of Continuing Education within the College of Administrative Science—a division which is organizationally co-equal with the professional graduate programs in public administration, business administration, and social work. Faculty participate in the short courses on an overload

basis, and there is relatively wide participation by the faculty of the College of Administrative Science. The chief attractions for participation are the opportunity for additional insight, broader contacts with practitioners, and the special type of stimulation from working closely with those involved in day-to-day management.

Usually state universities have extensive continuing education programs stimulated by professional clientele groups, and state or local government officials. Among state institutions, the University of Georgia probably has one of the largest, most varied programs in public service training centered in its Institute of Government. Although organizationally separated from the graduate program in public administration, which is located in the Department of Political Science, there has been a close tie between the Institute and the program, which facilitates a productive interchange. Client groups predominantly are made up of local and state officials with a sprinkling of federal agency officials from regional and district offices. Strong clientele interest and support mutually reinforce the competence and commitment of the faculty participating in such programs.

Some private institutions have been historic leaders in continuing education programs for the public service. From its inception the University of Southern California's School of Public Administration has been responsive to local and state officials for short-term training programs for professional and career development. The school has long operated a continuing education center at the University's Civic Center in downtown Los Angeles, making faculty resources more accessible to public officials. A variation on this is the participation by the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh in joint programs on public works, engineering, and administration with the University's Graduate School of Public Health and the School of Engineering—the three combining to provide not only graduate degree programs but short courses as well.

At the University of Oklahoma, although academically located within the Department of Political Science, the program is operated from the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education, with well over 95 per cent of the enrollment represented by students who are enrolled in non-resident courses. Although these courses are degree-oriented, it is clear that many students enter the program initially for self-development and gradually extend their studies to a degree program.

Chapter V

Program Dynamics:

Recruiting, The Learning Environment, Placement, and Program Cohesion

A program of public administration may be superbly organized for course content, accorded high status and munificent resources by the university, and possess nobly stated objectives, but the proof of its value lies in how well it works. The dynamic aspects of a program—where, how, and what kind of students it attracts; the richness and effectiveness of the learning environment; the ability to place students in satisfying, promising positions; and, the sense of professional identity which the program fosters—all tend to reveal the program's capacity to prepare students for professional careers in government.

Recruiting

The recruiting efforts of graduate programs in public administration can best be described as not very systematic. Typically, recruiting is limited to the mailing of brochures and flyers to other colleges and universities, the posting of information around the university itself, and whatever word-of-mouth advertising the program director and program faculty feel inclined to undertake, or for which they find time. Where a program has been in existence for some time and has achieved visibility in the public administration community, alumni may serve as intermediaries in reaching potential students. Program literature may be sent to the personnel offices in public agencies within the region which the university serves, especially if the program seeks to attract mid-career public servants. Generally, there is little active searching of a personal, face-to-face nature, and only a handful of graduate programs have what could be characterized as an alumni network of sufficient identification and loyalty to act consistently as a source for program candidates.

Source of Students

Only a few programs have attained a national identity, where students are drawn nationwide as a matter of course. Usually these are programs located in nationally recognized universities, or are programs that have developed a national reputation in the public administration community. Most programs serve the geographic region from which the university at large draws its students. There are some exceptions to this as regional universities develop programs of public administration with a special focus which attracts students from outside the region as well. For example,

over a period of 25 years, the University of Kansas has developed a national reputation for its program in urban management. Newer programs like those at the University of Georgia and the Institute of Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan (where the focus is on policy analysis) have begun to draw students from outside the region typically served by the university at large. The trend toward attracting students from outside the university's immediate region probably will continue as students are drawn in larger numbers to graduate programs preparing them for careers in the public service.

Political science continues to be the predominant undergraduate degree preparation for students entering graduate public administration programs. However, greater numbers are being attracted from the other social sciences such as economics, sociology, and psychology as well as an increasing but still small stream of students whose undergraduate degrees are in the physical and biological sciences or in engineering. In addition, graduate training in public administration is attracting increasing attention from students who seek professional degrees in such fields as law and medicine. A number of schools have programs making it possible for a student to take a combined degree in one of the other professions such as law or medicine and in public administration.

Caliber and Type of Students Sought

The caliber of students accepted in the graduate programs of public administration is improving as attested to by their increasingly higher average scores on the graduate record examination. Another measure is evaluation of their class performance by university faculty who are not part of the public administration program but who have public administration students in their classes. With few exceptions, these faculty attest to the excellence of the students' class performance and to their outstanding commitment and sense of purpose when compared with other graduate students in the social sciences or those attending professional schools. Entrance requirements generally have been tightened. In those programs stressing considerable quantitative skill, students must pass a qualifying exam to demonstrate the required skill level, or take non-credit remedial courses.

Although it is by no means a prerequisite, schools are encouraging applications from students with some full-time work experience between the award of the

baccalaureate degree and their application for graduate school. It is generally acknowledged that where students have had some break in their educational experience—whether for purposes of foreign travel, working to acquire the necessary funds to go to graduate school, or through military service—the additional maturity adds considerably to their perspective and their capacity to relate better to the course content. In spite of increased recognition of the value of work experience, few programs consciously seek students who are mid-career public servants, except where the school has a distinct mid-career program. Recruitment is aimed at the student interested in preparatory training for the public service.

Efforts to Recruit Minorities

Most program directors and public administration faculty personally are committed to attracting more minority students; however, few have had any notable success, possibly because they are uncertain as to how they should proceed.¹ Only a handful of universities outside of the South have the resources to sponsor recruiting forays to the Black colleges. The problem of identifying potential candidates is a real one which few universities are in a position to cope with successfully acting by themselves. This is less true of major urban universities or those located in areas where there are substantial indigenous minorities. One of the most difficult problems is that of making minority undergraduate students aware of and interested in career opportunities in the public service. This will require concerted attention by the universities in close cooperation with public interest groups and professional associations (such as the American Society for Public Administration and its affiliated Conference of Minority Public Administrators). It is worthwhile to note that the ASPA student chapter at the University of Georgia undertook a special program during 1971-1972 to contact departments of political science at Black colleges and universities within their region—both by letter and visits to the campus—to seek out interested candidates. Although the students were disappointed in not being more successful than they were, it is efforts like this, conducted on a continuing basis, which are needed if minority students are to be brought into graduate programs of public administration in proportionate numbers.

Another constraint limiting admission of minority students to graduate programs in public administration is the general inadequacy of resources available

for student financial aid.² With no significant federal government support for professional education for the public service, universities typically rely upon their regular student financial aid resources to support students in public administration programs. With few exceptions (for example, Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School where most students have been supported by special fellowship funds), graduate programs in public administration must rely upon general institutional resources for financial aid to their students. As a result, there are severe limitations on the number of qualified minority applicants they can attract.

The Learning Environment

The "learning environment" may be defined as the total context in which the student is stimulated to acquire knowledge and skills, and to mature in his capacity to apply them with confidence. In a professional school that content includes self perception, some sense of common perspective, a collegial relationship among faculty and students, considerable participation by the student through learning by doing, and close ties to the operational world of management.

Perception of Needs—Faculty and Student Views

Faculty views largely are reflected by the formal emphasis of the program. This is most apparent in programs of policy analysis where the principal need is seen as the development of quantitative and analytical skills which will permit students to develop and analyze alternative policy approaches to major public problems. Considerable attention is devoted to the "executive" view (principally meaning department and, especially, departmental staff levels), including both program and partisan politics at the upper reaches of executive departments and legislative politics associated with major public policy issues.

The emphasis at a school where the public administration program is combined with business administration or other types of administration differs considerably. Emphasis is placed upon quantitative analysis and especially upon economic analysis for the staff policy analyst rather than the working line official. Programs located within a political science department tend to emphasize the administrative staff functions like budgeting, personnel, and organization and management, plus both organization and political theory.

²The most notable exception is the NASPAA Urban Fellows Program sponsored by the Ford Foundation. Now in its second year, the program is designed to provide financial assistance to students or young administrators from minority backgrounds who seek graduate education in public administration or urban affairs, preparing them for leadership positions in urban administration.

¹In the public administration community, UCLA is conceded to have been most successful in recruiting minority students.

Generally, faculty view one of their principal functions as the interweaving of academic knowledge and the perspective of the practitioners' operating world. There is some hesitancy about emphasizing skills for fear of producing technicians who do not have a broad perspective.

For the most part, students agree with faculty on where the major emphasis in the program should be, although they lean more toward the practical, believing that the faculty tend toward developing broad perspectives rather than marketable skills. Many students express concern about their lack of preparation in public management. They want more instruction in how to plan and supervise a program or function. Where students have expressed doubt about the value of certain public management courses, that coolness usually is the result of a dull, routine lecture approach to the subject matter or to outdated lecture notes.

Students tend to agree that there is a need for greater analytical competence in public administration, but many feel that an inordinate amount of their curriculum has been devoted to the mechanical manipulation of quantitative and analytical techniques rather than to developing an appreciation for the techniques and a capacity for judging and for using the product. Partly in rebellion against what they see as a mechanical application of systems analysis, students seek greater awareness and application of human values, including the importance of person-to-person relationships in the administrative setting. To some extent this is expressed through interest in organizational development—a topic which receives considerable emphasis at some schools and virtually none at others.

More than anything else, students want to be prepared for a job and able to perform effectively from the beginning. Most doubt that they are receiving enough practical skills to give them self confidence. One of the reasons the students are keen on having an internship opportunity is that it gives them a taste of real experience and the opportunity to make contacts or good impressions which may help them obtain an interesting job upon graduation. Faculty tend to see internships as valuable in providing students some brief, if not always representative, experiences in a working bureaucracy.

Faculty—Student Relationships

The faculty-student relationships in programs of public administration appear to be closer and less formal than one usually finds in professional schools or academic departments. To some extent, both the professor and the student are seeking deeper understanding of the administrative process as well as the substance and nature of public policy. The professor

does not have the answers and few profess to in the same degree as is characteristic in schools of medicine, engineering, or law.³ This generalization about the close relationship between faculty and student in public administration programs is most accurate when applied to full-time students. It is considerably less true of part-time students or of those programs located in large metropolitan areas where half or more of the students consist of men and women working full time in career positions.

Faculty overwhelmingly prefer full-time students in their classes, principally because the student presumably has more time to explore the many elements of any particular course offering. By the same token, at least theoretically, the student has considerably greater access to the professor.

Since a large proportion of those students receiving financial aid earn it through research assistantships, a close relationship between a faculty member and student may develop via the student's role as a research assistant. Students frequently seek part-time work in a government agency as a means of financing their education; such opportunities often are developed on the initiative of individual faculty members and may involve some supervision by them.

Other factors which tend to bring students and faculty members into close and informal relationship with one another are courses which have an informal setting with individualized attention on the part of the professor, such as the laboratory environment of courses on quantitative skills, policy analysis, and economic analysis; the role-playing associated with laboratories for interpersonal relations; and computer laboratories, gaming, and simulation exercises. Although the student may work at his own pace more or less by himself in many of these circumstances, the faculty member is often more available on an individual, consulting basis than is true in the typical lecture or course.

Improving Courses and Techniques of Presentation

A great many of the faculty are engaged in various efforts designed to improve course content and the techniques of presenting material to students. Most campuses reflect the excitement and the willingness to experiment represented by these efforts, and this contributes to a certain air of expectation not found to the same degree in other graduate programs in the social sciences.

One of the most widespread methods being employed to make the learning environment more real-

³One reason for the self assurance among other professionals is the difference between the contexts in which law or medicine are practiced and public administration. Doctors and lawyers spend much of their time in a one-to-one relationship with clients—usually laymen—while administrators must operate in a complex milieu of groups, rarely in circumstances where their "expertise" is automatically accepted.

istic and open to the student is team teaching. The reason for employing it varies somewhat from campus to campus, although each program employing it attempts to draw the multiple benefits from this very demanding technique. It is used at Ohio State University in a deliberate attempt to bring an interdisciplinary approach to most of the course offerings. Typically, three faculty members, representing training and background in as many different academic disciplines, plan and present a course dealing with a principal topic of public policy or a public function. At Harvard and the University of Minnesota (both policy-analysis types of programs) the principal emphasis is to provide a realistic setting for the application of quantitative skills. The interdisciplinary aspect is also important, as such courses require the close planning and cooperation of those bringing the skills and background of the mathematician, economist, policy analyst, and public manager to bear in a particular exercise. It also is used in non-quantitative problem solving to provide a more realistic setting by presenting the perspectives derived from different disciplinary backgrounds as well as the practitioner viewpoint.

Another means for increasing the student's participation is the use of games. Problems of taxation and public finance are presented realistically by faculty members at the University of Georgia in a game which pits teams of students in competition—a game in which economic, political, and social factors have their respective costs and advantages for alternative strategies.

During the past decade the problems and advantages of various computer applications have been introduced into public administration programs as the use and impact of computers have become more widespread in government. A continuing difficulty has been to give students an intimate sense of the capabilities and limitations of computers without having to transform each student into a programmer. At least one system is being developed at the State University of New York (Albany) which bypasses the traditional machine-oriented program for a system approaching English syntax.

Most programs seek a variety of devices to tap practitioner experience. For example, Princeton conducts a lengthy policy exercise which involves senior practitioners who have a depth of experience and understanding in the particular substantive issue addressed. The University of Kansas uses a series of three-day intensive seminars where urban management practitioners, interns, and students explore major issues in a semi-structured open seminar. Outstanding practitioners serve as visiting lecturers or conduct special programs within a conventional class series.

One of the weakest elements in the learning environment is the relatively poor link between public administration research and teaching. Although it is usual in the classroom for faculty to apply the latest findings from their current research, there is little systematic incorporation of the lessons or findings of the research beyond that particular faculty member's classroom. The chances for broader incorporation are, of course, magnified when team teaching is involved. However, curriculum development through course content improvement could more consciously tap faculty research and consulting in the public sector. One means for stimulating this interchange would be a more concerted effort by faculty to write short case studies based upon their research and consulting activities.

Placement

Placement is one of the most important activities in any successful program of graduate professional education, regardless of field; graduate programs in public administration are no exception. Yet the importance of placement is probably least recognized in terms of faculty manpower and resources. Although public administration appears to have suffered less than some other fields at universities, there has been a pronounced decrease in the ease with which graduates are placed in all kinds of public service positions. Every institution acknowledges the need for some organized placement activity, and every university has its placement office. But few programs in public administration have what can be called an organized effort to place its students. Those best organized are likely to be found in the independent schools of public administration or public affairs or within schools of business and public administration. In the case of the combined schools, the business administration placement function is much better developed than that in public administration. Even among the independent schools, only a handful have an easily identified, continuing program for locating job openings. The Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University is by far the leader in this respect, staffing the placement effort adequately, and making use of well-organized alumni records and an alumni information network.

Few programs specifically allocate time to the placement effort on the part of any of the faculty members or of the program director. This means that the principal burden falls upon the students (individually or in a group) and upon those core public administration faculty members who exploit informal contacts in government agencies and elsewhere to assist students.

The general lack of an organized placement effort is not due to inadequate recognition by the faculty of

its importance. The faculty manpower just is not available in most cases to launch a well-organized, administratively supported effort. Equally important is the fragmented nature of the market. There is no central point, nor is there any reasonable collection of points, to which program directors or students can turn—especially in state and local government. Neither professional organizations nor public interest groups have anything approaching a comprehensive picture of where positions are available for which recent graduates might compete. Even in the federal government, neither the Civil Service Commission nor the central personnel offices of the major agencies have their fingers on the pulse of job openings except in after-the-fact fashion or where a large number of openings are occurring simultaneously. Informal contact points within city, state, and federal agencies are especially important during a fluctuating, relatively tight job market.

Another factor which makes placement, as well as the planning for a viable graduate program, difficult is the lack of adequate manpower projections at all levels of government by major categories of skill, program, or function. This prevents both the faculty in the development of the program, and the students in selecting program options, from having a clear understanding of where openings are likely to be in the future. Obviously, this problem can not be attacked successfully by individual colleges and universities. It will require the concerted pressure of all of them upon their professional associations, the public interest groups, and particularly upon the state and federal governments to provide better, more timely information if manpower requirements are to be met.

Placement is a growing problem for all universities. Significant improvement in the public service job market is unlikely in the near future. The anxiety that many graduate students in public administration face in their last semester about where they will find a job is increasingly destructive of the learning environment. This is especially true where students suddenly recognize that they will have to shoulder the major burden for identifying possible points of contact in seeking out opportunities. To the extent that a program fails to place its graduates adequately, the program will be identified, rightly or wrongly, as a failure and one which does not prepare its students adequately for the public service.

Program Cohesion

When can a graduate program in public administration be considered truly professional preparation for a public service career in contrast to a liberal arts graduate program representing a broad cafeteria of courses with an interdisciplinary emphasis? A princi-

pal weakness of graduate education for public administration is that programs tend to promise the former and deliver the latter. What is the difference? It can best be described as “program cohesion”—a term which encompasses such elements as an interrelationship among the various elements of the program, a sense of common purpose among the core faculty, the accrual of a sense of identity among students with their colleagues in the program, a pervading ethos or philosophy representing professional goals and ideals, and innumerable ties with the community of practitioners—all of which tend to reinforce an essence of common identity among the students, core faculty, and practitioners.

The traditional professional degree has been marked by a sense of distinct identity which tends to develop closer than usual ties among faculty, students, and alumni. These programs also are distinguished by a sense of common purpose and experience, broadly defined, a permeating philosophy, and a distinctive approach to its tasks—all of which bring greater cohesion to students in a professional degree program compared with other graduate programs. Public administration has not achieved the same degree of identification and cohesion as have law, medicine, or engineering. In general, both identification and cohesion are weak, suffering from a lack of a philosophical base or a reasonably distinct sense of purpose. In a few schools of public administration a sense of idealism and social purpose has developed that is stronger than the philosophical cohesion in other professional schools. A sense of professional identity can be reinforced through an active alumni network.

Program content is an important element in the development of program cohesion. Frequently the course content appears to lack integration. The program consists of a collection of courses among which the interrelationship seems vague and without focus. Most of the policy analysis programs have an advantage since their relatively close-knit schedule of required courses tends to provide more of a common experience for students than do most other programs. Theoretically, the strong emphasis upon quantitative analysis should provide a distinctive approach to problems. However, discussions with students at several of these institutions do not bear out the idea that they have achieved (or perhaps accepted) a distinctive approach. The greater the opportunity the students have for a wide choice in the selection of courses, the more difficult it is to provide an integrating mechanism through a continuing, required seminar extending the full length of the program and dealing with current public management problems where the knowledge, perspectives, and the skills from the other course work may be applied. Practi-

tioners may participate in the these seminars to discuss their current problems and to provide the context for student testing of concepts derived from their academic preparation.

In policy analysis oriented programs this integrating course may involve a series of exercises in policy development, analysis, and decision making where current public policy problems are tackled with the assistance of practitioners intimately involved in these problems.

Program cohesion is unlikely to be achieved if the core faculty members pursue individual interests with little or no interaction among themselves. Interdisciplinary team teaching helps to overcome traditional discipline-based boundaries. But the core faculty needs to have some common sense of purpose and identity if it is to instill a sense of professionalism into the students. Generally there is close faculty interaction and identity in the separate schools and independent programs of public administration. This conscious identity is particularly important where public administration is combined with other professional programs. There tends to be a strong interaction among the core public administration faculty in programs located within political science departments. Unfortunately, rarely have those programs structured any mechanism to facilitate interaction more widely among the departmental faculty.

Perhaps most important is a sense of professionalism which carries with it innumerable close ties to the community of practitioners. Community here is used in the broad sense, since it is recognized that public

administration lacks the clear identity of the traditional professions. Close ties with practitioners through alumni groups, recruitment activities, placement activities, consulting by members of the faculty, public administration research by both students and faculty, and continuing education activities which involve the faculty with members of the public service—all tend to foster a sense of professionalism and identity with the public service. Weak alumni, recruitment, or placement programs tend to weaken the development of identification with the public service. Where the university's policy encourages the faculty to work with public agencies in a consulting or research capacity, the ties are strengthened between the graduate program and the professional world of action for which the program is supposed to be preparing the student. It also provides opportunities for the development of contacts and information which can be fed back into the teaching program. Faculty participation in continuing education activity further strengthens the ties with the public service by broadening the contacts of faculty members and by encouraging them to make the additional effort required in bridging the gulf between academically derived knowledge and its application in the practical world of public affairs. All of these activities help reinforce the sense of identity with the public service and aid the development of a professional ethos. Without serious, conscious efforts to achieve this, it becomes difficult to distinguish a program which is supposed to be professional preparation for the public service from any other social science graduate program.

PART III
MEETING THE NEEDS OF TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE

Chapter VI

Evaluating Education for Public Administration

Who may properly evaluate graduate programs of education for public administration, and what guidelines can they employ?

Students, first of all, about to invest a never-to-be recaptured year or two of their lives in systematic and intensive study, need to know what they are likely to get out of their investment. Government employers equally need to know the qualities and the potential for growth of the men and women who come to them with professional training. University authorities, from instructors to presidents and boards of trustees (maybe the alumni too), have to evaluate their programs if they are to make the best use of their resources in meeting the needs of students, governments, and the public. Obsolescence is a constant hazard in education; but so, too, is pursuit of educational fads at the expense of fundamentals. The price of escape from both obsolescence and fadism is alertness and discriminating judgment.

This chapter is devoted to a series of suggestions for evaluating graduate education in public administration. Some will be offered tentatively, some will be in the form of questions, and some will be positive statements. In whatever form presented, all should be regarded as *suggestions* growing out of this study.

Educational Goals and Objectives

In considering goals (the broadest statement of purpose) and objectives (the intermediate points by which the ultimate goal is to be reached), three questions may be asked:

1. Are the goals and objectives clear and explicit?
2. Are the objectives realistic in the light of the institution's resources and its general role in the community it serves (local, regional, national or international)?

3. To what extent are the goals and objectives used in guiding decisions with reference to students, curriculum, faculty, organization, and support?

Unless the goals are clear and are known, there is little basis for judging the program from any point of view—university administrators, students, prospective government employers, or public. Clear goals are a necessary guide to policy choices of all concerned, and are essential in measuring progress.

It is reasonable to expect the principal goal to be preparation for a substantial working career in government as a real professional in public administration who is prepared for the adversities as well as the rewards of a career in government, who can bear the

burden and heat of the day, and who can do an effective job in making government perform its critical role in modern society.

An educational program's objectives should be realistic in the light of all of its circumstances. A university which has an established relationship to a locality, a state, or a region should serve it through its educational program for public administration. That established market should have primacy in its recruitment and placement efforts, and in its program emphasis. Program directors should disregard neither their natural strengths nor their normal contexts.

Educational institutions with a national or international reputation and a normal student body drawn from widely scattered areas have a different problem in determining their priorities. Should they continue to aim for national and international administration? Should they attempt to cultivate the local market? Not even the best endowed institutions can afford to scatter their resources.

Goals are no better than the weight given them in action. A plan that is not employed is meaningless. Circumstances change, as do values, but the goals and objectives should be reflected in policies with reference to students, curriculum, faculty, organization, and support, or the explicit goals should be revised to conform to purposes which, in fact, are guiding program decisions.

Students

Policies and practices with reference to students are an important element in an educational program. There are four principal types of students who require somewhat different treatment.

The largest group consists of government employees studying part time. Graduate schools in urban areas can and usually do cater to this group. They normally accommodate student needs in the time of scheduling classes, but more important is the extent to which they offer instruction specifically designed to meet the professional and intellectual needs of government employees. A program which does so intelligently scores a plus. One which merely admits students to existing courses designed for other purposes is missing an opportunity to maximize its impact. Students who are already in government have solved the placement problem, presumably have some commitment to government, and are ambitious enough to seek self-improvement. They deserve encouragement and assistance through courses designed to meet their needs.

A second group, usually neglected, consists of the mid-careerists on campus for full-time study. A university which accepts mid-careerists has an obligation both to see that they get the most out of their study and that the university gets the most out of them as an educational asset. Too often they are treated like other students with no systematic attempt to tap their experience for the benefit of fellow students. Seldom has either objective been taken seriously, except to open up the university's course offerings to be sampled more or less at will. Other desirable features of a mid-career program are:

1. A philosophy regarding acceptance of mid-careerists, an educational purpose in doing so, and some definite educational objectives. This is most important of all, and is generally lacking.

2. Expert guidance in course selection from someone who knows the university and can help the student analyze his own educational needs.

3. One common course, seminar, or other learning experience for the entire mid-career group.

4. Contact with responsible officials of sponsoring agencies about their perceptions of the needs of individual mid-careerists.

5. Some mixing of mid-careerists in seminars with the pre-entry students who lack experience in government. The mixing is profitable for both groups.

The third group of usually younger persons preparing for public administration, but as yet without much experience, tends to get most of the attention of graduate schools of public administration, public affairs, and public policy. But the policies and practices dealing directly with pre-entry students vary. Desirable features are:

1. Recruitment from the school's natural clientele or market.

2. Financial support for promising students who need it.

3. Enough diagnostic classification of students to know their principal intellectual and personality traits.

4. Review and analyses of these data over the years to improve the selection of students and also the placement of graduates. There is little significant data to guide the selection of young men and women for careers in government. Continuing study of these records should help to tell educational authorities whether they are on the right track or not in recruiting, curriculum planning, and placement. Something more than GRE scores is needed to determine whether prospective students have capacity for leadership, for bearing responsibility, and enduring stress in public administration. Consideration should be given to establishing national or regional interviewing services to aid student selection.

5. Some emphasis upon prior working experience in selection. This is justified because of its subsequent effect in speeding up the learning experience, especially in courses having to do with human relations, organizational behavior, and the work situation. It is less useful as an educational facilitator in abstract subjects. Experiments with required work experience, not necessarily in government, should be encouraged for all students.

6. An active, adequately staffed placement program. In the present relatively unstructured employment market, substantial assistance in placement is needed. Too often only token or casual assistance is given. If it is coupled with responsibility for arranging internships, a substantially full-time placement officer will be required for each 40-50 graduating students in a two-year program.

The fourth group of students is only now beginning to be reached, but they are very important. They are students in established professional schools, many of whom ultimately go into public administration. The engineers have yet been little touched; more lawyers and the medical doctors are conscious of a need to know something about public administration. As professional schools become ready to open their curricula to public administration, the graduate schools of public administration should be ready to respond with courses of instruction designed to meet the needs of each new group. Now is the time to take the initiative in approaching the older professional schools and to prepare appropriate courses of instruction. The first step normally is a joint degree program, already an established arrangement on a limited scale in a number of institutions. A second step is to offer public administration courses for inclusion within traditional professional degree programs; this is not beyond the token state anywhere. It will take persistent effort and strong university support to advance with either step. Graduate schools of public administration should take the lead and push ahead with these programs.

Program Content

Two different philosophies are evident in programs of education for public administration, public affairs, and public policy. Both have merit, and it is not practical or desirable to pursue either one alone. One is the philosophy of individual development which emphasizes broad understanding of the socio-economic-political world in which the public administrator operates. The other approach, in the traditional professional school, acquaints the prospective professional practitioner with a fairly discrete body of data, the principal procedures of practice, and the values and perspectives of his profession, and begins the process of developing his professional skills.

The professional emphasis is important and has been too long neglected. If the MPA is not prepared to practice, and has no skills to apply, he is not professionally trained. It is equally true that, unless the student has an understanding of himself and of the world in which he is to work, he will not be able to grow enough to keep up with his profession; and his ready skills will, in time, become obsolete or irrelevant.

Curriculum

A course of study should cover four elements: (1) knowledge of the context of public administration, (2) analytical tools, (3) knowledge of individual and group behavior in organizations, and (4) knowledge of a subject matter field in public administration.

The first is knowledge of the contextual environment of public administration, including the western democratic political tradition, American constitutionalism, the machinery of government, and the organizational behavior and administrative practices through which policies are formulated, decisions are made, and action takes place. It is necessary to know the administrative culture from high-level ideals to low-level conventions. Unless one knows the evolution through which the present political-administrative system developed, he is unlikely to understand the present system or the values, standards, and ideals which characterize public administration. And if this is lacking in the graduate, he can scarcely be regarded as having a professional education in public administration. These are some of the important factors which distinguish public administration from business administration or private professional practice.

The second essential element in the curriculum consists of analytical tools useful in problem identification, problem analysis, presentation of data, program planning, and reporting. Precise verbal skills as well as the tools of mathematical or statistical and economic analysis are important. Some sophistication in statistics has been recognized increasingly over the past third of a century to be important for administrators in government. The progress in applying mathematics and economic analysis to specific operational problems as well as to broad issues of policy, reinforced by the development of the computer, now makes these analytical capacities more important than ever.

There are three levels of sophistication which may be recognized: (1) familiarity with general concepts, understanding of the potential uses and limitations of those modes of analysis, and rudimentary skills in statistics and economic analysis; (2) knowledge and skill sufficient to undertake staff work in analysis under the guidance and direction of an expert; and (3) depth of skill sufficient to qualify as a specialist,

at least at an elementary level. Which level a student should seek depends on his aptitudes, interests, and professional ambitions, but he should be able to make useful application at whatever level of skill he attains. What level of instruction a graduate program should offer depends upon the program's, and the university's, resources. It is desirable to offer instruction through the first two levels. However, students interested in and qualified for public administration vary in mathematical aptitude. Unless this aptitude is weighted heavily in selection of students, and until university students generally carry their education in mathematics much farther than has been the mode, it will be necessary to provide for more than one level of instruction in any student group of substantial size.

In recognizing the essentiality of instruction in analytical tools, it would be a mistake to minimize the equal importance of developing facilities in other logical ways of thinking and communication. The professional administrator should be able to avoid inconsistent argument and imprecise communication himself and to recognize and counter them in others. His acumen in this area is likely to be tested more often than any other, day in and day out.

The third essential element is a knowledge of individual and group behavior in organizations. This is both time and culture bound. He should be familiar with the different cognitive styles in the world today, but particularly those in his own intellectual/cultural tradition where he will have most of his contacts. The administrator, working with others in an organization, doing business with other organizations and individuals both in government and in the private sector, needs to be aware of and have some understanding of their thought processes and cognitive styles. He also needs to be conscious of his own intellectual habits and modes of thinking—perhaps the most difficult and valuable insight of all.

Attention should be given to the nature and role of leadership in the dynamics of organization. The person educated for public administration and preparing for an anticipated role of leadership should understand the heavy demands upon his energy and resources if he is to maintain, motivate, move, or change the organization for which he has responsibility. He should also realize how much he will be dependent upon others—his superiors, peers, and subordinates. And he should recognize in this dependence, the corollary power which these ties and relationships can provide.

A fourth element is knowledge of a subject matter field in public administration. Public administration as a field of action is always specific and concrete, never general and abstract. As Millett has pointed out, public administration is a collection of government

enterprises, each one with its own purposes, objectives, problems, and programs.¹ These enterprises are concerned with specific problems such as national defense, agriculture, social welfare, domestic peace and order, space exploration, and education. The fullest knowledge of public administration comes in studying it in the substantive as well as the cultural context. Treating public administration apart from particular problems being confronted and the concrete programs being administered is unreal. Focusing on a specific matter area makes clear the intermingling of policy and administration (concepts which are useful abstractions) and deepens an understanding of the nature of both. Substantial knowledge of a particular field of public administration also helps the graduate in finding a place to make a start as a practitioner.

Pedagogy

What are the means by which this knowledge and these skills can be taught most effectively? There are no simple answers and, fortunately, there is considerable experimentation going on. A guiding principle should be the maximum possible "learning by doing."

Team teaching by an interdisciplinary staff in a seminar setting can be effective and rewarding to the participants, faculty as well as students. But it is expensive. It is invaluable in organizing and launching new courses. However, the expense puts pressure on the budget, and as deans and directors of programs look for ways to cut costs, "teams" tend to shrink to one man. Conceivably, a few required core courses could always be team taught. The following standard is suggested for interdisciplinary team teaching: (1) always at least one such course required, or almost universally elected, in a program; (2) new courses of interdisciplinary character to be launched by teams; and (3) all such courses to be reviewed, revised, and refurbished by teams at not longer than five-year intervals.

The *conference course or simulation* is a tested method of teaching, employed in a variety of forms, in which student participants have assigned parts. They research their part and defend the position in a simulated real-life situation—for example, a legislative committee or similar group handling a policy problem. They can develop their skills in investigation, analysis, and written and oral presentation. If there are time pressures, they have some experience with stress, and they must face the challenge of peer group criticism and faculty evaluation. This method has been employed with success in various forms since the 1920's.

The *group colloquium* is a similar method in which the entire faculty and class study a live prob-

lem intensively for a period of three to five days. This can be done in close collaboration with nearby public officials who are concerned about the problem. Or, on a problem of the national government, selected public officials can be brought in as resources. Live problems are preferred in the predecision stage. Issues can also be studied profitably after decisions have been made, and when the returns are coming in—hindsight can be revealing.

The *research seminar* along traditional lines gives a useful training in fact finding, analysis, and expression, although it is not ideal for the person preparing for a professional career as a practitioner. Where the professor in charge arranges to work with public officials on one of their problems, however, a dimension is added which increases the value of the experience for the student.

The *more conventional seminar* in which students individually prepare and jointly review papers based on student investigation of individual topics, usually from library sources, can give valuable training if handled with adequate faculty criticism and coaching of individual students. But it is effective only if rigorous standards of investigation, analysis, and expression are maintained, and it is less useful for the practitioner-to-be than for the young scholar.

The *lecture course* is still in vogue. Its appeal is to the financially pressed dean or director. One lecturer can educate, stimulate, entertain, or bore as many students as the hall will hold. But for the student it is not an efficient device, except as it is closely related to a problem or project on which he is working, and as an adjunct to his own intellectual activity. Heavy reliance on lecture courses in a graduate program of education for public administration would be a weakness.

The Internship

There is general agreement that the internship can be extremely valuable to the student educationally and an aid in later placement. It can be regarded almost as essential to deepen the perceptions and to develop an awareness of situations, values, and nuances of relationship that are difficult to explain in a classroom. In medicine, the laboratory and clinic lead into a formal internship before independent practice begins. In public administration, the internship is the laboratory and the clinic as well as the internship. It is particularly important if the student has had no prior experience in government. If graduate schools come to require in-government working experience for admission, the internship will not be so necessary. However, when prior experience is not required, an internship can be regarded as a must.

¹ John D. Millett, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 5, pp. 421-428.

Internships are not automatically effective. They require a substantial investment from the graduate school in locating suitable berths, and making good placements in those berths. There must be a supervisor of the intern on the job who will put him to doing educationally meaningful work, and who will give the intern enough time and attention for adequate guidance and evaluation. Good supervisors of interns are rare. They have to like an educational role and they have to be able, and willing, to give some time to the intern. The intern, on his part, has to be able to make a contribution in his internship tasks and must show enough promise to make it worth the supervisor's while to assist the student. That means the student must be well selected for his post. The graduate school authorities must know him well enough to make a good placement.

A period of three to four months between the first and second years of an MPA program probably is a minimum time. A program which does not have the equivalent of one full-time faculty person to manage the internships (assuming he has placement duties as well) for each 40 to 50 student interns can hardly be effective. In a time of scarce resources the internship part of the program is a low priority claimant for funds. This is unfortunate, since it probably is more productive educationally to simplify the instructional program in order to free staff time to strengthen the internship program. University authorities are reluctant to invest funds from the instructional budget in manpower to arrange internships, place interns, and evaluate the performance of both intern and sponsor. It doesn't look like a teaching system, but the internship is a learning experience.

There are various substitutes for the internship experience. They usually consist of some form of investigation or research under faculty supervision on a live problem, working with public officials. Although useful, none of the substitutes quite matches the experience of work-for-pay in government under a capable supervisor who takes an interest in the education of the intern.

Advantages to the university of a good internship program are twofold: it results in a more mature and finished graduate, and it demonstrates to public officials the quality of the educational product. A good internship program is a way of selling the university's program of professional education.

The Tie-In to Practice

The professional training program needs a tie-in to practice, a continuing relationship that keeps faculty in personal touch with the practitioners and their problems. This means a faculty that is active in realistic research, consulting, and at least occasional work in government. An extended tour of duty in govern-

ment is a fine foundation on which to build. However, a teacher can not live on his past experience as intellectual capital, no matter how rich it was, for it depreciates rapidly unless it is continually augmented. This requires greater university encouragement for faculty leaves of absence than most universities like, and academic recognition of time spent by faculty in government. A supportive policy is necessary for faculty attempting to teach public administration. Faculty members also must be willing to leave the campus occasionally for work in government, in which they will have less freedom and less independence than they have on campus. Faculty initiative is essential. Without it, the public administration program will tend to lose vitality and validity.

There is some experimentation with short term visitors on campus who are administrators or political figures in residence at the university with few duties except to be available. This ambiguous role doubtless adds something of interest, especially to undergraduates. But without an active part in the instructional program, the resident administrator is unlikely to have much impact.

Some administrators can become effective teachers. There must be some aptitude and the skills have to be perfected in practice. There are risks for the university in attempting to convert administrators into faculty members but it has been done successfully and the universities should take the chance more frequently to enrich the faculty mix.

Program Length

Most of the MPA programs for pre-entry students require two academic years of study. This is a better program than a one year plan—better in both breadth and depth, and enough better to justify the time spent. One academic year of study is sufficient, however, for the mid-career program. It is as much time as most persons on educational leave from government can spend, and, with adequate guidance, the academic year can be highly rewarding. The student without prior government experience needs a longer time to cross the bridge from *learning about* to *operating in* his field—that is, to acquire a professional's perspectives, basic knowledge, and rudimentary skills.

The two-year MPA program is to be preferred as the standard, but should not be a fixation. Experiments are in process to find ways of saving time, especially for the student who is in some way exceptional. Where this can be done without risking narrowness or superficiality, it should be encouraged. Instructional programs which go to the student, or which permit him to work on his own with continuing faculty guidance and two-way communication, are needed and should be encouraged, provided that

the reality of the learning process is preserved, and that it does not become a mechanical exercise.

Public Administration in Sister Professional Schools

The students from sister professional schools who come into graduate schools of public administration for a joint degree do not present a serious problem. The combinations with law, public health, medicine, and engineering are fairly easy to make. Efforts of this sort now underway are encouraging. The mode is to add one year of public administration to the other professional school program, expanding the student's time on campus by that year. A logical next step is to telescope the two professional fields to avoid the full year's add-on. Each field should give up something. That makes it hard, but some thought is being given to it. The first graduate school of public administration to bring it off will establish its leadership.

A more difficult step is to offer instruction in public administration to other professional school students as part of their own degree program. First ventures are underway. They require good planning and some tough choices. What are the most vital elements in public administration that can be compressed and taught without fatuous superficiality? The present tendency is to telescope the policy-analysis courses—perhaps a good starter. But will that alone, or best, prepare a law student for public administration? What about the institutional context? What about organizational behavior? What about the dynamics of leadership? What will best prepare the young lawyer for an eventual period of service in government as an administrator, not just a government lawyer? There is much work yet to be done before the graduate schools of public administration can provide effective instruction in public administration within other professional school programs, but it is a challenge that must be met if public administration is to have its fullest impact. Schools which are pushing ahead in this effort are opening up a most significant new area of instruction.

Faculty

Faculty are the heart and mind of a university. More than any other group, they determine the character, quality, and effectiveness of the educational program. Efforts to build a superior faculty are central in academic administration. Unfortunately it is not easy to do. Human beings are notoriously difficult to evaluate, and it is even more difficult to predict their future. A promising scholar at 25 may be continuously productive for 40 or more years; he may fail to develop at all; or he may fade away at 45. He may also be a superior, average, or inferior teach-

er. Furthermore, he may be a very decent human being, or he may be impossible to get on with. It does not take higher mathematics to see that the variations and combination of plus and minus qualities are numerous.

Many of the stronger universities tend to insist upon both teaching ability and scholarship, and are willing to put up with whatever personality traits go with excellence in teaching and research.

The difficulty in faculty recruitment is to go behind the symbols and to exercise discriminating judgment. A Ph.D. from a reputable institution creates the presumption that a person can do independent research. But it is at best a probability. If he does turn out articles and books, will his work be of high quality? Will he be a leader in his field? Or will he merely grind out items to lengthen his bibliography?

As a teacher, does he enthrall students, does he bore them, or does he develop them? Unless he does the latter, is he effective?

Deans and directors of graduate schools of public administration face all of these normal problems and, in addition, some which are particularly their own.

The first is to find men and women of real intellectual distinction who are willing to venture out of their disciplinary nest and try their wings in applying their skills and insights to the problems of public administration. Mathematicians and statisticians—mathematics being neutral—do not find it difficult, especially since government is producing much significant quantifiable data. Renaming government “the public sector,” and the change of attitudes it symbolizes, make it relatively easy for the economist. Psychologists and sociologists also tend not to be reluctant to deal with public administration problems. Political scientists were first and foremost among the social scientists in the field for a long time, and perhaps still are, although the recent anti-establishmentarian bias may have created hostilities that seriously handicap some political scientists for work in public administration. All in all, it is probably easier than it has been before to recruit a faculty from relevant disciplines. But the recruiter is still looking for the exceptional teacher/scholar—those who are different from the mode and are willing to venture, innovate, and experiment.

In addition to these intellectual qualities, the faculty needs above-average commitment to the program, for in most institutions public administration, by whichever name it is called, does not rank high in prestige. The academic scholar going into the public administration program needs enough confidence in himself to be willing to depart from the mainstream of his discipline.

A third quality is interest in individual students. More students in public administration will need, and

benefit from, hand feeding than in traditional professional schools, which send students through fairly standard courses into highly structured professions.

The fourth problem is to develop a faculty with enough professional experience, and sufficiently strong links to the practice of public administration to create a genuine practitioner point of view in the program. The recruitment of most of the faculty from the academic disciplines has a skewing effect. Faculty tend to be research minded, rather than operations minded. The fresh emphasis upon policy analysis reinforces this skewing. Policy analysis tends to culminate in the decision on what to do, preceded by a weighing of alternatives (with their costs and benefits) measured quantitatively, if possible. Big issues are preferred to small ones, and the important question of when and how to do what is to be done tends to be neglected. The decision making preoccupation of social scientists in general may reinforce this neglect of the question of *how*. Conceivably, all action can be reduced to a series of decision, plus an energy factor, a skill factor, and a timing factor. But the decisions which are initially and perhaps inherently most interesting are the initial decisions on objectives and broad policies to reach them. In this weighing of alternatives with their costs and benefits, does it not tend to be assumed that the policies can and will be carried out? If so, the assumption begs the critical question of public administration—the one on which progress is being held up for lack of performance.

When seen together, the needed combination of faculty qualities presents a formidable challenge to the faculty recruiter: intellectual distinction as a scholar; competence in teaching and in the development of individual students; unusual commitment to the public administration program; professional experience as a practitioner in public administration, including some with an operational as distinguished from an analytic perspective; willingness to venture into an interdisciplinary program; and ability to innovate in developing it. Almost no individual faculty member will have all of these qualities. But together they may.

Organization and Support

In the light of nearly half a century of systematic efforts to give formal instruction in preparation for professional work in public administration, four requirements stand out in the organization of an effective program:

1. The program must have its own identity so that there is an identifiable faculty and group of students with common purposes and objectives. Without this identity and common effort, the program tends to lack vitality.

2. Those responsible for the program, the dean or director, and faculty must have autonomy in developing and carrying out the program. They must be free to move ahead. No freedom in this world can be complete, but the public administration program needs as much freedom as any other professional school or teaching department over time, and more in its early years.

3. Of critical importance is a leader—or leaders—in charge of the program, of senior faculty standing, who is committed to the program, has enthusiasm for it, and is prepared to see it through. The dean or director is obviously the key man, but he will need the firm support of three or four senior colleagues who also are fully committed.

4. The program, to be effective, needs support: moral, administrative, and financial. It needs support from university authorities, from sister departments and other professional schools, and from its teaching faculty. It is particularly important that the faculty in charge of the required courses and the courses principally elected be tied into the program administratively. Joint appointments with other departments have their merits, but the primary commitment of the key faculty should be to the public administration program—administratively and financially, as well as intellectually.

Financial support is essential to the program's vitality. Team teaching to organize and develop new courses is expensive, particularly in the early years and in the periods of review and revision which are highly desirable. The manpower costs per student will be higher than in the social science departments, from which many faculty are drawn, and where classes tend to be larger. But when capital costs (for laboratories) are considered, the overall costs of instruction may be no higher than in physics, chemistry, or biology.

Funds are needed for fellowships to make sure that a significant number of students will be of superior ability and that students from poor families are not excluded. An upper-class bias in the student body would be unfortunate and would seriously limit the educational effect of the student culture. There is general awareness of the need to provide educational opportunity for students from ethnic minorities. Funds tend to be a limiting factor.

Funds are needed also to support research and public service activities of the faculty and students. Although the sums required need not be large, it is important that they be readily available, so that faculty members can plan projects that involve the school in work with public officials and on current public problems. Funds sufficient to pay for one-third of the time of the five or six faculty members who are most active in the program, plus an equal amount to cover

other research costs of projects, would probably be enough, on the average. For a school of public administration, public affairs, or public policy, government itself is the laboratory. Research funds simply make it possible to work in that laboratory.

As has been noted in earlier chapters, education for public administration is being provided as part of a departmental program, as an interdepartmental program attached to a research bureau or institute, as part of a business school program or an administrative sciences program, and as a separate school of public administration, public affairs, or public policy. Which is the best?

What is the best structural base in any given university depends upon the educational resources available when the program is established—the strengths and weaknesses of the university for public administration training, the attitudes of related schools and disciplines represented on campus, personalities, financial resources, both the initial and the intended ultimate size of the program, and the unique culture of the institution. All of the factors have to be taken into account in providing a structural base for the program. The best arrangement on one campus may not be the best for another. Also, the best initial arrangement may not be the best arrangement later on when the program has gathered strength and gained mo-

mentum. What is important is that any organizational arrangement provide for essential identity, autonomy, leadership, and support. In time the independent school structure is more likely to provide these essentials for programs of substantial size and vigor. But there will always be exceptions.

There is a final point in evaluating a school or program which is intended to educate men and women for public administration. It is the overall quality of the effort as reflected in: (1) understanding of the program and its objectives; (2) recognition of the difficulties that stand in the way of success, especially quick or easy success; (3) appreciation of the great contribution to the public good which is ultimately possible; and (4) deep commitment to the goals. This combination of realism and idealism, if it permeates university administrators, including trustees or regents, deans and directors, faculty, and students, may do more over time to make the program effective than any other factor. To the extent that it can be known, it is a critical factor to a student in selecting the school in which to study, to the prospective faculty member in deciding whether or not to throw in his lot with the program, and to the potential financial backer pondering the question of whether or not to invest in the program. In a sense this is a matter of spirit and philosophy, and it is vital.

Chapter VII

Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service: A Program of Positive Action

It takes but little reflection on the preceding chapters to recognize that current programs of education for public administration are not meeting present professional needs and, without considerable rejuvenation, most certainly will fail to meet the needs of tomorrow's public service. However, blame for these inadequacies cannot be placed conveniently at the doorsteps of the program directors or faculty. The deficiencies represent symptoms of deeper root causes as to why public administration, generally as practiced and taught today, has not proved adequate to the challenges facing the public service. Solutions to these problems lie with: (1) governments—federal, state, and local; (2) the universities where programs of public administration are located—particularly the governing elements of the universities; (3) the public administration programs—principally the directors and faculty; and (4) the profession—those practitioners, scholars, and others who constitute the public administration community and consciously identify themselves as public administrators.

Deficiencies

Before suggesting what each element faces in the way of challenges, and how they might be met, it is useful to list the more apparent deficiencies in programs of education for public administration.

1. *Program goals are vague and unrealistic.* Where goals are stated, they tend to be in such generalities that it is unclear what the students are being prepared for. Most programs express general aspirations of a global nature, unrelated to institutional resources, the university's clientele, or the primary region which it serves.

2. *Resources are inadequate to meet the needs of the program.* With few exceptions, programs do not receive the funds or the personnel (either teaching or administrative) needed to operate a vigorous program. Student assistance, support services, and facilities are under financed. Faculty are given heavy teaching loads and provided inadequate recognition, in terms of teaching load credit or remuneration, for counseling and administrative duties. Universities pay lip service to their programs of public administration, but fail to back this with institutional commitment of resources except where the program has the status of a separate professional school. Clientele support is weak, reflecting limited and poorly organized efforts to cultivate this resource.

3. *Program curricula do not meet current professional needs, let alone future needs.* Too often the curriculum represents a collection of courses that are available, rather than an integrated interdisciplinary professional program. Few programs carry through a conscious effort to provide continuity of professional perspective peculiar to the public service. The lack of program integration reflects inadequate commitment to common goals by faculty from different departments. There is insufficient contact by students or faculty with the community of practitioners, although this has long been the hallmark of education for the professions. Students receive only limited contact with the kinds of problems faced by practitioners through laboratory settings, field visits, internships, applied research, and the exchange of scholars and practitioners. Little attempt has been made to influence or to penetrate the curricula of other professions whose graduates frequently enter the public service. Courses often reflect past practices or current fads, but not tomorrow's needs. In spite of the obvious need for improving program performance in government agencies, inadequate attention is given to public program *management*.

4. *Continuing education is tragically neglected.* Future needs reveal a critical role for continuing education in the concept of professional development, yet most faculty (and too many university administrators) fail to see the relevance of continuing education to the role of the university. There is a rising awareness in some quarters of the university community of both the needs and the potential of continuing education.¹ It provides an opportunity for the focused application of university talent in a fashion that should contribute to improving society. It also has been and should continue to be an income-producing program for the university. Excluding continuing education from the mainstream of university activities is especially shortsighted for those universities which are engaged in education for public administration, because the resulting gap weakens an already inadequate program-clientele relationship—a relation-

¹For example, a conference recently brought together approximately 40 academicians, practitioners, and representatives of public interest groups to discuss how the two communities might relate better, draw upon each other's resources to meet pressing public problems. It was jointly sponsored by the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh and the Office of Management and Budget, U.S. Executive Office of the President, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, December 7-8, 1972.

ship that is crucial to a successful professional program of education for public administration. If universities do not organize to meet the need, other institutions will, to the ultimate disadvantage of the universities.

5. *The functions of recruitment and placement are not conducted systematically.* Since few institutions devote any significant resources to these functions, they fall to those faculty who voluntarily accept them as extra duty. The disorganized manner in which these functions are approached results in the failure to follow up on graduates in order to develop better contacts with the community of practitioners or to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. This disorganized approach also reduces the capacity to locate and to motivate qualified minority candidates for the programs or to place them most effectively.

The Challenge to Government

The institutions of government at all levels—local, state, and federal—have a tremendous stake in efforts to improve the public service and to prepare it to meet the needs of the future. This challenge is addressed principally to those in positions of leadership and authority where the power to act and follow through resides: political executives, legislative leaders, and senior civil servants.

The challenge to government is to take effective, timely action along three mutually supporting fronts: (1) the development and maintenance of effective systems of public service manpower planning, (2) the development of career systems characterized by flexibility and continuity, and (3) the commitment of resources commensurate with the need for the continuous improvement of the public service.

Public Service Manpower Planning

The lack of any but the scantiest sort of manpower planning for the public service contributes significantly to the confused state of recruiting and placement activities within university programs of public administration as well as to the disparate recruitment activities of governments. It also encourages the development of program goals which are broad enough to cover almost any contingency, but which are virtually useless in the process of determining program objectives and planning curriculum. If governments are to obtain the type of trained manpower needed, at the point in time when needed, and where needed, both program and coordinating agencies must consciously place greater systematic effort at projecting manpower needs and making this information available to other agencies, levels of government, universities, and potential candidates. From time to time, considerable effort has been placed by the federal

government upon the manpower planning requirements in particular occupational categories, such as scientists, aeronautical and space engineers, and medical doctors. At least as much attention should be given to manpower planning for urgently needed public administrators. This responsibility is first and foremost one of government.

Career Systems Providing Flexibility and Continuity

Although the federal government, many states, and some cities have civil service systems, rarely are they conceived of as a system whereby an individual achieves a rewarding career which presents opportunities and options as well as some degree of certainty. With the exception of agencies having closed personnel systems, (such as the police, firemen, Public Health Service, the military, public education, or the Foreign Service), the concept of regular progression coupled with systematic efforts to improve individual skills is too often left to the personnel departments, and does not have adequate recognition or support from senior management officials.

A well-developed career system would make systematic use of university programs—both as providers of new talent and as a source of competence for providing training assistance. Such a system also would be characterized by new institutions within government or established outside of government for the purpose of further developing selected employees for different or higher-level duties. These could be staff colleges, executive institutes, special training, or education centers which are recognized as important, contributing elements in a total career system. The system should pursue the conscious, systematic shifting or interchange of personnel at various levels of responsibility between organizations and among levels of government to provide both personal enrichment and to expand institutional perspectives.

The Federal Executive Institute and the Intergovernmental Personnel Act at the federal level, and state public executive institutes at the state and local levels, are recent steps in the right direction, but these need great expansion if they are to have any pervasive effect in making important contributions to the development and maintenance of a true career system in the public service.

A persistent problem has been the inability to achieve the needed level of professional leadership among those key officials with authority to act—political executives, legislative leaders, and senior civil servants. The general lack of interest on the part of political executives and most legislative leaders suggests that they are unaware of the critical role performed by the public service and the means most likely to improve its performance. This means that a more aggressive role must be played in pressing for

more adequate career systems by those public officials and other public-spirited citizens who recognize the need.

Resources Adequate to the Needs

For nearly two decades governments have invested heavily in the education, training, and development of professions or occupations perceived to be in critical need—especially medical personnel, engineers, foreign language specialists, and scientists. Yet there have been no categorical programs to support similar efforts in public administration (in contrast to more technical aspects or occupational groupings found in the public sector such as law enforcement officers and mental health specialists, among others). Title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Education for the Public Service, has yet to receive any funding.

If anything has been learned over the past decade, it should be that the spending of substantial funds and the employment of highly trained technicians are not alone sufficient to assure the success of public programs. Yet almost nowhere have resources been provided to improve the general management capability of the public service—that is, the public managers. Large amounts are unnecessary, but billion dollar governments cannot be managed without the application of resources to cultivate, acquire, educate, and train public managers. This requires funds for: (1) college and university programs in public administration teaching, research, and student assistance; (2) the development of new institutions such as staff colleges, education centers, and new programs of continuing education; and (3) the extension and further development of programs for the interchange of personnel among governments, between agencies, and between governments and academic institutions, and the provision of internships or trainee positions.

For too long political executives and legislative leaders have assumed that, because government jobs generally pay well and attract numerous candidates, they necessarily were being filled by individuals who had the education and the commitment to meet the challenges of the public service. The increasing complexity of public programs, combined with the increased expectations of the public whom they are designed to serve, present greater, more difficult challenges to the public service. The evidence of general dissatisfaction of the public with the performance of government reflects this combination. It is time to recognize that higher pay and improved benefits alone will not provide the kind of talent necessary to manage public programs effectively at the local, state, or federal levels. Until elected representatives and other senior officials recognize their responsibility and take positive action through improved public service manpower planning, the more systematic devel-

opment of career systems, and the commitment of the resources necessary for the improvement of the public service, governmental performance will not attain the level required.

The Challenge to Universities

During this century universities have been the principal locus of the professional leadership and the source of the highly trained specialists and technicians whose talents provided much of the power for change and growth in our society. Thus, universities must accept the considerable challenge of making those changes necessary to provide the essential trained manpower to lead society in the future. The university has the capacity, if it has the will, to be the principal contributor in meeting the future needs of the public service. An important share of the responsibility will rest with university administration—the boards of trustees, presidents, provosts, and deans who have the authority to fix goals, shift resources, reallocate facilities, and reorganize to meet new responsibilities.

Two critical challenges face universities: (1) the ability to re-establish contact with their constituencies, and (2) the willingness to change in order to meet the needs of society. Default in either of these could isolate them, seriously sapping their vitality and effectiveness.

Re-establishing Contact

Recent years have witnessed a spate of reports, articles, and speeches describing the gulf that emerged over the past decade between institutions of higher education and their constituencies.² The universities' constituencies—in addition to their students—consist of the state legislatures, foundations, parents of students, and alumni who provide the essential financial support to universities, as well as the businesses, government agencies, professions, and other institutions of society which provide employment to their graduates.

Increasingly, the university must become more responsive to the research and educational needs of the locality, region, or nation which it serves. The university is being asked to demonstrate its value to society by applying its capabilities to those problems considered important by society. Supplementing this force is the shift of student interest toward preparation for those occupations they perceive to contribute most to the solution of major societal problems and the improvement of society. Discussions with faculty,

²For example, see the "Newman Report;" the ACE Special Report, "Degrees for Non-traditional Students," April 1971; and the speech of Peter L. Berger, Rutgers University sociologist, as reported in the *U.S. News and World Report*, Vol. LXXIII, No. 23 (Dec. 4, 1972) pp. 56-58.

students and university administrators during site visits to 16 universities consistently revealed a substantial increase in enrollment in courses in public administration and expanded interest in learning more about the public service by students preparing for other professions. Few of the universities visited appeared to have either exploited or accommodated such shifts in "constituency interest." This leads to the second principal challenge to universities—the willingness to change.

Willingness To Change

If the university leadership is unwilling or unable to fulfill its responsibility through accepting new roles, shifting resources, changing its organization, and revising the traditional system of rewards, then the universities will largely be unable to meet the professional needs of the public service in the coming decade, and other institutions will come forward to take the leadership. It is at the university level that organizational and resource support has to be made available if education and research programs for public administration are to be made fully effective.

The interdisciplinary nature of public administration and its professional thrust can only be fully successful when provided within an organizational context that permits full program integration. This means that the university, if it is going to offer programs in public administration, should give them the status and identification of organized professional programs under responsible leaders who have authority and resources to act. Treating education for public administration as an educational overlay or tenuous, ad hoc arrangement among several teaching departments is no longer adequate. To be effective:

- The supervision and arrangement of internships will have to be treated like the supervision of thesis students.
- Leaves of absence or sabbaticals taken to achieve working experience in public agencies will have to be treated like sabbaticals to conduct research or lectures at sister institutions.
- Applied research in clientele organizations will have to be recognized as making a contribution to the profession as does basic research to the academic discipline.
- Participation in non-degree programs to sharpen skills or broaden the perspective of practicing public administrators should be rated as equally important as the preparation of undergraduate or graduate students.
- Resources for research on the public service will have to be given equal or greater priority than laboratories for biology, chemistry, or physics.

- Interdisciplinary research peculiar to the professions and particularly to public administration should be judged by a university for its contribution to the public service and to the profession, rather than for its impact upon any single discipline.

None of these changes will be easy to achieve, since most cut across the grain of the deeply entrenched, more or less self-centered disciplines which dominate university faculties. Universities that take the risk and are responsive, however, are likely to become the leaders in preparing individuals to direct the major public programs of the coming decades.

The Challenge to Public Administration Programs

The principal challenge to public administration programs since their inception has been to demonstrate that they have an important contribution to make through conducting research and providing education relevant to the solution of public problems and the management of public programs. Most public administration programs can achieve significant improvements beyond their current state in three principal areas: (1) an integrated program with a professional focus and more explicit objectives, (2) a more aggressive search for and better utilization of available resources, and (3) a better balanced, coherent curriculum.

A Well-Integrated Professional Program

A professional program in public administration should have as its principal purpose the training of individuals for the management of public programs, and the improvement of skills and broadening of perspectives of those already in the public service. The program should be so organized and integrated that functions of student recruitment, intern placement and supervision, performance evaluation of the student, and ultimate placement are all part of a total professional program. The professional program must seek the candidates deeply interested in government, not just those who qualify intellectually. It must also integrate into its professional program the mid-career practitioner who returns to the university for a year of study, as well as the practitioner taking a non-degree course outside of the typical university schedule. If the program director and his faculty do not reflect common commitment to an underlying ethos of the public service, one cannot expect the students to acquire a professional perspective.³

Fortunately, many faculty appear to be ready and able to provide this cohesive element, though it may not be supported by an integrated curriculum. The program must avoid trying to be all things to all peo-

³For one description of the areas of common commitment for the professional in public administration, see Appendix V.

ple. Rather, it should be directed to those objectives and that clientele which best fit its resources and normal region of outreach. Whatever subject matter specialties are offered should be offered in depth. This requires faculty thoroughly knowledgeable in the subject and with important research or practitioner experience in the field.

In terms of realistic goals, a program should not attempt to offer the Ph.D. degree unless the program faculty and the university leadership are willing to invest the time and resources to assure broad interdisciplinary preparation and the opportunity for significant practitioner experience as key elements in the program. A serious weakness in many courses of public administration today is that the students are taught *about* public administration rather than being *taught* public administration, because the professor has no first-hand knowledge of the responsibilities or problems which confront the public manager on a day-to-day basis.

Effective Acquisition and Utilization of Resources

While it is true that public administration generally has lacked necessary resources for teaching, research, and student financial support, program directors and faculty too frequently have failed to exploit those resources that were available, or have not made effective use of resources at hand. The federal government particularly offers a number of categorical programs in training and research which, though not specifically identified with public administration, can be tapped by public administration programs. Until more general-purpose financial support is available, program directors and public administration faculty will have to be more entrepreneurial in their outlook and aggressively seek out sources of funding to develop new courses, to support applied research, and to assist their students. The more that programs prove their value in terms of providing well-trained students and research which aids in solving agency problems, the more these sources of funds will become available to public administration programs.

A Revitalized, Coherent Curriculum for Public Administration

The first sections of this report have described briefly major phases in the evolution of public administration as a professional field and have characterized the changing, dynamic character of the contemporary public service in the United States. This process of change and development will continue, taxing our capacity for understanding the nature of public administration and its scope. Therefore, it would be inappropriate, indeed, shortsighted and educationally unsound, to prescribe a single curriculum as "best" in preparing all students for professional careers in the

public service. Today, however, there is so much curricular diversity among programs described and advertised as "public administration" as to constitute chaos. Can we expect public administration programs to be considered sound preparation for a professional career until there is some minimum, recognized core curriculum more or less accepted throughout the profession? Developing the elements of such a minimum core curriculum poses a major and urgent challenge to leaders in the field—both educators and practitioners.

A critical need in public administration curricula is for an explicit and clear philosophy and a recognized ethos of public administration with which students and faculty can identify. A common philosophy is needed to provide linkages, understanding, and professional spirit among students, faculty, and the practitioner community. Programs which do not strive to achieve and sustain this common understanding and commitment are likely to continue to be poorly integrated collections of courses with a defective cumulative professional impact.

Another essential improvement required in public administration curricula is to give greater emphasis to, and update the treatment of public management—how to run a program. Recent trends emphasizing decision making and policy analysis have enriched public administration, but partially at the expense of identifying public management with the older theme of teaching the staff functions. Some faculty take refuge in the view that public management is not a process which can be learned at a university. Neither of these views is valid if the faculty are willing to invest the energy in the development of more laboratory-oriented courses involving substantial student participation where they learn primarily by doing rather than by listening. It is probably true that students will not learn to be effective managers through the typical lecture process.

Finally, much more systematic attention needs to be devoted to the updating and improvement of teaching materials. This is especially urgent as programs begin to move more rapidly into laboratory-type situations where students use case studies or participate in simulation exercises, problem solving, and other dynamic activities. It may be necessary to develop new institutional means for preparing teaching material and for sharing it broadly across the field—not only within universities but with special training institutes and with in-house government training organizations.

The faculty and administrators who provide the principal guiding force to programs of public administration in the United States can successfully meet these challenges only if they act together as a concerted professional team rather than in the more traditional university role as individual, isolated scholars.

No program can survive as a truly professional program without a cadre of faculty whose principal commitment is to the profession of public administration, rather than to one of the academic disciplines of the university.

The Challenge to the Profession

A series of forces and movements have converged upon government making it absolutely essential that public administrators assert their identity as professionals and consciously work together in order to create a sufficiently visible force to reinvigorate the public service in state, local, and federal governments.

The increasing responsibilities thrust on governments at all levels by the citizenry have resulted in programs which are enormously complex, intricate, subtle, and technical because they go beyond economic reform and technological change to attempt social reforms which require changing the habits, attitudes, and lives of people. These programs are risky and uncertain, involving considerable commitment and the expenditure of great energy and talent if they are to meet expectations. At the same time that programs are growing more complex and difficult to administer, political leaders, reinforced by growing public impatience over poor performance in many of the newer programs, have turned increasingly to bright amateurs and successful managers from the private sector to head major public programs. The career administrator may be largely overlooked by these political executives through ignorance about his special skills or through associating him with past program failures. At the other end of the government structure, rising unionization of the public service, copying the industrial model, has begun to confront the senior career administrator as the institutional representative of agency management. But a counterpart to "management" in industry has yet to be clearly identified in public service organizations. Thus the career administrator frequently finds himself caught between these forces; viewed on the one hand as superfluous or barely useful by political superiors who lack understanding of public organizations and their processes; considered the source of decision and authority by subordinates organized to press their demands; and identified by the public as the well-paid "bureaucrat" who tends to make programs unresponsive, undependable, and too expensive.

In spite of this demanding environment, there appears to be little awareness among political executives and legislators of the need to structure careers for managers of professional caliber, to encourage adequate preparation of such people in colleges and universities for entry-level positions, or to develop effective programs to improve their capability and broaden their perspectives once they are in govern-

ment. Most of the concern for these needs has been limited to the rather loosely identified, frequently fragmented public administration community. The development of professional standards, professional competence, professional *esprit de corps*, and professional commitment has been left largely to chance.

There are at least three positive steps that the public administration community, through its professional associations, should undertake to improve education for public administration and to develop the profession as well: (1) actively promote the profession by demonstrating its capabilities, (2) develop an explicit set of professional standards which can be used at least as guidelines for characterizing the profession, and (3) organize a systematic program to provide advice, contextual data, and financial support for the development of more realistic teaching materials for education and training programs in public administration.

Consolidating the Profession

Public administrators will not be able to exert their full influence as a profession until the special knowledge and expertise which they offer to the solution of the major problems of our society and the effective management of public programs designed to serve that society are recognized. This entails the more conscious identification of public administration as a profession and public administrators as professionals. This, in turn, calls for promoting recognition of the significant contributions of the profession. At best this is a difficult process because of the traditional ethic of the anonymous public servant. But public acknowledgement of the contributions of this profession is an essential base upon which to build the kind of identity which should be developed among those who are preparing to enter the profession. And the job of imbuing pre-entry students with this sense of identity belongs to the professional schools of public administration.

The Development of Professional Standards

An informal, if not fully recognized, certification process has been developing in the profession for years. It is the MPA degree. Increasingly, mid-careerists return to universities (full time or through night courses), not only to gain new knowledge or skills, but to earn the "certificate." The unfortunate part of this process is that the presumed certificate really has no common currency and, as one member of the study panel observed, it is appalling that some one can be granted an MPA degree and not know what the field is all about. It is not just the responsibility of the university programs in public administration, but a responsibility of the profession at large to provide guidance on what constitutes, at a minimum, the

skills, knowledge, and ethical standards for a public administrator. Ultimately, this may lead to a more formal certification process—hopefully, one based upon performance criteria directly related to proficiency in public management.

Institutionalizing Guidance to Programs for Education and Training in Public Administration

In addition to developing recommendations with respect to core requirements for training in public administration, considerable effort needs to be expended by both scholars and practitioners in uncovering and making available material that will improve the teaching of public administration. For example, there is a great need for an institutional mechanism to support, develop, and foster the interchange of new case studies in public administration, laboratory exercises for policy analysis and public management, and innovative computer programs. Practitioners could well be more helpful in generating financial support for the development of teaching material and research which can eventually be fed into the teaching process.

The overriding need is for the profession to recognize its common interests and to begin to take concerted action. It must be explicit about what it has to offer, honestly recognize its deficiencies, and move ahead. The mechanisms of the American Society for Public Administration, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, the National Academy of Public Administration, and affiliated groups should be exploited aggressively toward this end.

* * * * *

The prospects for graduate education in public administration are both discouraging and encouraging. The problems being tackled by government action are more ambitious, complex, and costly than ever before—creating corresponding challenges and opportunities for administrators. And the simultaneous move for decentralization and centralization of national programs creates new needs for creativity in administration. The technology to be drawn upon has also expanded. The administrative capacity of state governments is being tested as never before, resulting inevitably in a stronger market for trained personnel, no matter how disorganized the market may be. The pressure upon city governments is so evident as to need no emphasis, and the progress of unionization has created a new situation for administrators. In this situation there is both need and opportunity.

It is evident that administrative institutions, organizational arrangements, personnel systems, administrative policies, and operational practices will have to undergo serious adjustments to meet the new conditions and to carry the increased load. More than ever, students see public administration as an area where they have the opportunity to make a difference. This is a challenge to public administration and to the graduate schools of public administration. Many of the necessary pieces are there to be put together to create a more effective public service. To put the pieces together requires leadership—from educators and their schools, from practitioners and their government agencies, and from the public administration community and their professional organizations.

APPENDICES

Preceding page blank |

61

APPENDIX I

List of Participants in the
Delphi Exercise on Developments
Affecting the Public Service, 1971-1980*
(September–November 1971)

James A. Alloway
President
New Jersey Civil Service Commission
Trenton, New Jersey

Allen V. Astin
Former Director
Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C.

James Banovetz
Director
Public Administration Program
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

James Beck, Jr.
Director
Bureau of Training
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, D.C.

Marver H. Bernstein
Professor
Woodrow Wilson School of
Public and International Affairs
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Junius J. Bleiman
Director
Mid-Career Program
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and
International Affairs
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Frederick Bohlen
Assistant to the President
Ford Foundation
New York, New York

A.P. Bouxsein
Associate Director
Institute of Public Policy Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Don L. Bowen
Professor
School of Business and Public Administration
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Robert R. Cantine
Office of Budget & Executive Management
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Morris W.H. Collins, Jr.
Director
Institute of Government
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

William G. Colman
Consultant
Governmental Affairs and Federal-State-Local
Relations
Potomac, Maryland

L.P. Cookingham
Former City Manager
Kansas City, Missouri

F. Robert Coop
Regional Director
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
San Francisco, California

John Corson
Chairman of the Board
Fry Consultants
Washington, D.C.

Phil Dearborn
Budget Officer
City Hall
Cleveland, Ohio

Brewster C. Denny
Dean
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Maureen Erwin
Operations Analyst
Office of Regional Liaison
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C.

George H. Esser
Program Advisor
Division of National Affairs
Ford Foundation
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

*Participants' affiliations are shown as of the time of the exercise—September - November 1971.

Saul Feldman
Associate Director for Community Mental Health
Services
National Institute of Mental Health
Rockville, Maryland

Harold Finger
Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C.

Joel Fleishman
Director
Institute of Policy Sciences & Public Affairs
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Sidney Gardner
Consultant
San Francisco, California

Andrew J. Goodpaster
Supreme Allied Commander in Europe
SHAPE

John A. Gronouski
Dean
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Luther H. Gulick
Chairman of the Board
Institute of Public Administration
New York, New York

Bertrand M. Harding
Associate Administrator for Manpower
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington, D.C.

Frederick O'R. Hayes
Former Director of the Budget
City of New York
New York, New York

Charles Henry
City Manager
University City, Missouri

John C. Honey
Professor
Maxwell School
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

S. Kenneth Howard
Professor
Institute of Government
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Phillip S. Hughes
Senior Staff
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Bert Johnson
County Manager
Arlington County
Arlington, Virginia

James T. Jones
Professor
School of Public and Business Administration
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Roger Jones
Consultant
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Mark E. Keane
Executive Director
International City Management Association
Washington, D.C.

David N. Kershaw
Director, Urban Opinion Surveys
Division of Mathematica Inc.
Princeton, New Jersey

Franklin P. Kilpatrick
Dean
College of Social and Behavioral Science
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Robert Kipp
Director of City Development
City Hall
Kansas City, Missouri

Ronald B. Lee
Assistant Postmaster General
U.S. Postal Service
Washington, D.C.

David Leininger
Administrative Assistant
City Managers Office
City Hall
Dallas, Texas

Matthias E. Lukens
Deputy Executive Director
The Port of New York Authority
New York, New York

John W. Macy, Jr.
President
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
Washington, D.C.

James W. Martin
Director
Institute for Budget and Management Training
College of Business and Economics
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Roscoe C. Martin
Professor
Department of Political Science
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Harvey Mansfield
Professor
Department of Public Law and Government
Columbia University
New York, New York

William Medina
Chief, Executive
Development & Training Branch
Office of Management & Budget
Washington, D.C.

Michael Michaelis
Arther D. Little, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Peter A. Michel
Staff Assistant
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Rufus E. Miles, Jr.
Former President
Population Reference Bureau, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

John D. Millett
Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio

Thomas D. Morris
Assistant to Comptroller General
for Management Services
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C.

Lloyd Musolf
Director
Institute of Governmental Affairs
University of California
Davis, California

James A. Norton
President
Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio

Harold Orlans
Senior Staff
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

John A. Perkins
Professor
Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Ben Posner
Assistant Director for Administration
U.S. Information Agency
Washington, D.C.

Don K. Price
Dean
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Henry Reining, Jr.
Dean
The von KleinSmid Center for International and
Public Affairs
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Peter Rumsey
Office of Management & Budget
Washington, D.C.

Heather Low Ruth
Assistant Administrator for Program Analysis and
Development
Environmental Protection Administration
City of New York
New York, New York

Fred A. Schuckman
Budget Director
Budget Division
State of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut

Richard L. Seggel
Dep. Asst. Secy. for Health Policy Implementation
Department of Health, Education & Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Con F. Shea
Executive Director
Department of Social Services
State of Colorado
Denver, Colorado

Harvey Sherman
Director
Organization & Procedures Department
Port of New York Authority
New York, New York

Frank P. Sherwood
Director
Federal Executive Institute
Charlottesville, Virginia

Lloyd M. Short
Professor Emeritus
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Elmer B. Staats
Comptroller General of the United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C.

David T. Stanley
Senior Staff
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Richard E. Stewart
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
First National City Bank
New York, New York

Donald C. Stone
Professor
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Carl F. Stover
Consultant
Washington, D.C.

John H. Strange
Chairman
Department of Political Science
Livingston College
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

James L. Sundquist
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Stephen B. Sweeney
Formerly Director
Fels Institute of State and Local Government
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Wayne E. Thompson
Senior Vice President
Environmental Development
Dayton Hudson Corporation
Minneapolis, Minnesota

William E. Warne
Consultant
Water Resources Development
Project Formulation and Appraisal
Agency Organization and Administration
Sacramento, California

Graham W. Watt
Deputy Mayor
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

York Willbern
Professor
Department of Government
University of Indiana
Bloomington, Indiana

John D. Young
Chief
Economics, Science, and Technology Program
Division
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX II

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN ACADEMY SURVEY

A. Mail Survey, February 1972

American University	Northern Illinois University
Arizona State University	Ohio State University
Brigham Young University	University of Oklahoma
University of California-Berkeley	Pennsylvania State University-Capitol Campus
University of California-Irvine	Pennsylvania State University
California State College-Long Beach	University of Pittsburgh
University of California-Riverside	Princeton University
Carnegie-Mellon University	University of Puerto Rico
University of Cincinnati	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Cornell University	University of Rhode Island
University of Florida	Sangamon State University
University of Georgia	University of South Dakota
Harvard University	University of Southern California
Indiana University	Southern Illinois University
University of Kansas	Southern Methodist University
University of Michigan	Stanford University
University of Minnesota	Syracuse University
University of Missouri-Kansas City	University of Virginia
Middle Tennessee State University	University of Washington
State University of New York-Albany	Wayne State University
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	University of Wisconsin-Madison

B. Institutions Visited, April 1972

Four criteria were used in selecting 16 institutions for site visits from among the 43 respondents. The criteria were: (1) reputation for excellence and innovation, (2) representative of one of the four types of program organization (separate School of Public Administration or Public Affairs, combined with business administration or others in a college or school, separate institute not located within a department, program within a department of Government or Political Science), (3) geographic representation, and (4) willingness to cooperate.

Separate Schools

Harvard University
John F. Kennedy School of Government
University of Minnesota
School of Public Affairs
State University of New York-Albany
Graduate School of Public Affairs

Princeton University
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and
International Affairs
University of Southern California
School of Public Administration
Syracuse University
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

University of Washington
Graduate School of Public Affairs

Interdepartmental Institutes

Brigham Young University
Institute of Government Service
University of Michigan
Institute of Public Policy Studies

Combined Schools or Colleges of Administration

Cornell University
School of Business and Public Administration
University of California-Irvine
Graduate School of Administration

University of Missouri-Kansas City
School of Administration

Ohio State University
College of Administrative Science

Programs within Departments

University of Georgia
Department of Political Science
(administrative aspects in the Institute of
Government)

University of Kansas
Department of Political Science

University of Oklahoma
Department of Government
(in conjunction with the Oklahoma Center for
Continuing Education)

APPENDIX III
AIRLIE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS
July 1972

James A. Bayton
Department of Psychology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Don Blandin
Associate Executive Secretary
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and
Administration
Washington, D.C.

Edwin A. Bock
President
The Inter University Case Program
Syracuse, New York

John E. Brandl
Director
School of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Robert Cantine
Office of Budget and Management
District of Columbia Government
Washington, D.C.

Richard L. Chapman
Study Director
National Academy of Public Administration
Washington, D.C.

Frederic N. Cleaveland
Provost
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Richard C. Collins
Federal Executive Institute
Charlottesville, Virginia

William G. Colman
Consultant
Governmental Affairs and Federal-State-Local
Relations
Potomac, Maryland

Roy W. Crawley
Associate Executive Director
National Academy of Public Administration
Washington, D.C.

Thomas W. Fletcher
Director
Continuing Education Service
Washington, D.C.

George A. Graham
Executive Director
National Academy of Public Administration
Washington, D.C.

Janet Hansen
Assistant Dean
Undergraduate College
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Jerome J. Hanus
Associate Dean for Graduate Programs
School of Government and Public Administration
The American University
Washington, D.C.

Kenneth Howard
Assistant Director
Institute of Government
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

John H. Jeffreys
Institute of Government
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

James T. Jones
Professor of Public Administration
School of Public and Business Administration
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Franklin P. Kilpatrick
Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Lennis M. Knighton
Professor of Accounting and Public Administration
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Mordecai Lee
Graduate Student
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Ronald Lee
Director, Marketing Analysis
Xerox Corporation
Stamford, Connecticut

William Medina
Chief, Executive Development and Training Branch
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

John D. Millett
Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio

James M. Mitchell
Director
Advanced Study Program
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Elmer K. Nelson
Director
Public Administration Program
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Harold Orlans
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Heather Ruth
Assistant Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
City of New York

Donald C. Stone
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Robert F. Wilcox
Head, Office of Understanding of Science
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX IV

Attributes of the Public Service: Their Relative Attainment, 1961-1971

(using a 10 point scale, 0 = completely failed to attain, 10 = completely attained)

Respondents were given 12 attributes significant in judging the quality of the public service. They were asked to select the 6 most important and to assess where the U.S. public service was in 1971 and where it was a decade earlier on each attribute.

	Means		Calculated t
	1961	1971	
1. Honesty and impartiality in the conduct of assigned responsibilities.	6.70	6.60	-.59
2. Cognizant of, and responsive to, the desires and wishes of the public.	5.22	6.19	+3.23*
3. Encouraging organizational innovation and experimentation with new ways of conducting the public business.	4.26	4.95	+2.62*
4. Emphasizing value and worth of individuals, both in government and outside, and need to respect dignity and worth.	5.08	6.08	+3.65*
5. Employing a reward and incentive system that attracts the highest quality personnel and retains them for long careers.	4.97	5.81	+2.77*
6. Public confidence in the capacity and integrity of the public service.	5.90	4.50	-5.83*
7. Committed to merit principles in appointments and promotions throughout the system.	6.72	6.33	-1.00
8. Maintaining strong, progressive manpower planning and career development programs.	4.37	5.59	+5.55*
9. Responsive to changing needs and sufficiently flexible to move in new directions rapidly.	4.62	5.05	+1.65
10. Fully responsive to political leadership established by the electorate.	6.05	6.02	-.18
11. Able to adapt to technological change and take maximum advantage of technological innovation.	5.00	5.95	+3.65*
12. At all administrative levels, broadly representative of the heterogeneity of American society as a whole.	3.57	4.39	+2.73*

*Calculated t is significant at the .05 level using the repeated measures formula.

	Means		Calculated t
	1961	1971	
Composite of the 12 attributes	5.18	5.53	+2.58*

APPENDIX V

ELEMENTS FOR SOCIALIZING STUDENTS IN A PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The following elements were originally directed toward education for urban administration, but they are equally applicable to public administration generally. They can be viewed as what a professional degree program should seek to inculcate in students beyond learning skills and acquiring relevant knowledge. They are excerpted from Frederick C. Mosher, "End-Product Objectives of Pre-Entry Professional Education for Urban Administrators and Their Implications For Curriculum Focus," a paper presented at the Symposium on Educating Urban Administrators, May 31–June 2, 1972, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Symposium was sponsored jointly by the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, the Fels Institute Graduate Associates, the International City Management Association, and the National Academy of Public Administration.

1. A continuing concern about and quest for ultimate *values* and *goals* of social action which would overpass the values and goals of any single profession, discipline, or other specialism.

2. An approach to situations and problems that is *synthesizing*—i.e., bringing relevant information and ideas together in the search for feasible solutions, all things considered—rather than compartmentalizing and reducing.

3. An orientation to *decision* and *action* rather than the accumulation and development of theoretic knowledge, rather than the "search for truth." The . . . administrator must seek the most promising feasible courses of action on the basis of information which is always imperfect. That means, among other things, he needs a considerable tolerance of ambiguity.

4. A primary orientation to *whole people* rather than things, as in engineering and the hard sciences, or to parts of people, as in medicine, or to particular aspects of people, as in economics and political science. The people orientation should comprise: an over-riding concern for the quality of the lives of people as individuals and in groups or categories; a

sympathetic curiosity about people's problems: and ability to communicate with, and particularly listen to, people whatever may be the color of their skin, their sex, their social and economic status, their points of view, their strengths and frailties.

5. A ceaseless and restless striving for *change* of conditions, institutions, methods, organizations in directions conducive to the achievement of social values, rather than an instinctive fear and resistance to change or the tendency to accept all the difficulties one finds in . . . administration as "givens" within which he must work.

6. A capacity to perceive, define, and attack problems as *problems* and an accompanying ability and desire to move from problem to problem—i.e., problem-oriented *mobility*.

7. A sympathy for *open politics* and open political processes and for the ideal of *self-government*, whatever may be their difficulties, inconveniences, and delays.

8. An underlying *optimism* about human beings and more particularly about the capacity of mankind to control or influence the conditions confronting them for the better.

This study was conducted under the general guidance and authority of the Academy's Standing Committee on Education for Public Administration. Although the content and direction of the report are the responsibility of the authors, the Committee provided advice and a sense of direction at the initiation of the study; and, through the Panel, more direct review and supervision of the study.

Standing Committee on Education for Public Administration

Don L. Bowen, Professor
College of Business and Public Administration
University of Arizona

Alan K. Campbell, Dean
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs
Syracuse University

Frederic N. Cleaveland
Provost
Duke University

Morris W.H. Collins, Jr.
Director
Institute of Law and Government
University of Georgia

L.P. Cookingham
Formerly City Manager
Kansas City, Missouri

Thomas W. Fletcher
President
National Training and Development Service
Washington, D.C.

William T. Golden
New York, New York

Bertrand M. Harding
Associate Administrator for Manpower
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington, D.C.

Ferrel Heady
President
University of New Mexico

Roger W. Jones (*Chairman*)
Consultant
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Mark E. Keane
Executive Director
International City Management Association
Washington, D.C.

Ronald B. Lee
Director, Marketing Analysis
Xerox Corporation

William A. Medina
Chief, Executive Development and
Training Branch
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Frederick C. Mosher, Professor
Woodrow Wilson Department of Government
and Foreign Affairs
University of Virginia

Richard E. Neustadt
Associate Dean
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Henry Reining, Jr., Dean
von KleinSmid Center for International and
Public Affairs
University of Southern California

John W. Ryan, President
Indiana University

Frank Sherwood
Director
Federal Executive Institute

Lloyd M. Short
Professor Emeritus
University of Minnesota

Donald C. Stone, Professor
Graduate School of Public and International
Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

Carl F. Stover
Chief Executive Officer
Federalism '76
Washington, D.C.

Stephen B. Sweeney
Dean Emeritus
Fels Institute of Local and State Government
University of Pennsylvania

Graham W. Watt
Director
Office of Revenue Sharing
U.S. Treasury Department
Washington, D.C.

Robert F. Wilcox
Dean
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Colorado

Officers and Trustees

Officers

James A. Norton, Chairman
James E. Webb, Treasurer
Roy W. Crawley, Secretary (and Executive Director)

Trustees

Alan K. Campbell, Dean, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
Frederic N. Cleaveland, Provost, Duke University.
Alan L. Dean, Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Management and Budget.
Harold B. Finger, Manager, Center for Energy Systems, General Electric Company.
Ronald B. Lee, Director, Marketing Analysis, Xerox Corporation.
John D. Millett, Vice President and Director of the Management
Division, Academy for Educational Development.
James A. Norton, President, Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation.
David T. Stanley, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution.
Graham W. Watt, Director, Office of Revenue Sharing, U.S. Treasury Department.

National Academy of Public Administration

The National Academy of Public Administration was created in March 1967 to serve as a source of advice and counsel to governments and public officials on problems of public administration; to help improve the policies, processes, and institutions of public administration through early identification of important problems and significant trends; to evaluate program performance and administrative progress; and to increase public understanding of public administration and its critical role in the advancement of a democratic society. In attempting to achieve these goals, the Academy draws upon administrators, scholars, and other persons in public affairs in the study of problems, the evaluation of performance, and the anticipation of significant developments.

From an original membership of 19 (all past presidents of the American Society for Public Administration), membership has grown in a series of annual elections to a 1972 total of 143 active, six emeritus, and eight honorary members. Criteria for membership include substantial scholarly contributions to public administration, or significant administrative experience, and demonstrated concern for the advancement of public administration.

1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036